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Introduction

Students know little about the differences between professors that they may at some point come in contact. Students rely heavily on hearsay of others to learn about the teaching style of professors. This hearsay is non-scientific, relying on mainly opinions instead of fact. The Teaching Style Survey (TSS) looks at a professors' teaching style and how it relates to the students' learning style. With this information, students will be able to find professors that complement their learning style, not blindly picking the professor just to fill a time slot. This becomes particularly important when looking at multiple section and elective courses offered by the university. These courses have numerous professors to select from, many being professors that students are unfamiliar with. The enclosed paper will describe the process taken in developing the TSS, the controversies that arose from implementation of the survey, and the future of the survey.

While working with the Western Student Association (WSA), to be specific, the "Grading the Professor" program, I saw many flaws that led to high levels of dissatisfaction from both students and faculty. This program was initially envisioned in 1991 as a tool for the students, enabling them to evaluate their professors on an out-of-class basis. The program was used through 1994 until continuous problems warranted a change. Many of the problems arose from faculty members who felt that the instrument was inaccurate and also that students didn't have the knowledge of the field to actually assess if that professor was teaching the class well or not. The students, on the other
hand, were disappointed by the poor participation. Knowing these problems, my focus needed to be one that was non-threatening to the faculty and informative and useful to the students. Originally when I looked at the issue of teacher evaluation, I turned my thoughts directly to the “Grading the Professor” and departmental evaluation instruments. I believed that by revising questions, or by finding more efficient methods for distribution and collection of data, I could simply improve the current system utilized by the Western Student Association for the past five years. I quickly realized that this was not the case. The only way that a student-based evaluation instrument would work, would be if the "teacher evaluation" questions were removed. This finding eliminated much of the research that I had been doing, yet valuable information was gathered from this research regarding evaluation in general, so it was not all for naught.

In 1993 John A. Centra authored a book by the name of Reflective Faculty Evaluation which went into detailed description regarding current evaluation practices throughout the United States. He also gives a history and overview of teacher evaluation in general. Centra states that "the first formal student evaluation of teachers probably took place in the universities of medieval Europe" (Centra, 1993, p. 49). He believes that evaluation can be broken down into four distinct periods: " the thirty-years preceding 1960, the 1960's, the 1970's and the period from the 1980's to the present" (Centra, 1993, p. 49). Before the 1960's, Herman Remmers brought together the Purdue evaluation model. This model could possibly be considered the first student evaluation form when it was published in 1927. The 1960's brought many campus protests that were related to the Vietnam War and also related to policies in effect upon the campuses. The 1960's also brought wider use of student evaluation, and when conducting research on this topic for
this thesis, many of the sources came directly from those years. The 1970's brought "the
golden age of research on student evaluations" (Centra, 1993, p. 50). Amazingly, on
college/university campuses a large number of "department heads ranked student
evaluation among the top three sources of information on teacher effectiveness and
moreover, believed them to be the most important source" (Centra, 1993, p. 50-51).
Within the final of the four, the 1980's to the present, it is stated that the period has
included "the continuing refinement of the research, and a series of reviews and meta-
analyses that has substantiated the findings on important issues" (Centra, 1993, p. 51).

Centra continues on to identify different identifiable factors that can be seen in
many if not most evaluation instruments. The most common of these factors are broken
down into six distinct areas which include: (Centra, 1993, p. 57).

1) Organization, planning, or structure

2) Teacher-student interaction or rapport (sometimes broken
down into two factors, instructor-individual and instructor-group
discussion.)

3) Clarity, communication skill

4) Work load, course difficulty

5) Grading and examinations, assignments

6) Student learning, student self-ratings of accomplishments or progress

These factors go over the majority of areas of evaluation, but the problem as seen on
Western's campus is that most of these areas are bound to bring up student judgment of
competence type questions. These areas also correspond with some of the problems that
the individual departments have had with their own evaluations, as professors have in the
past voiced their opposition because of the students inexperience in the actual area of
study. Even more controversial, Centra states that some writers argue "that the various
factors should receive differential weights for tenure and promotion decisions" (Centra,
1993, p. 57). Again, on Western's campus this would never pass faculty approval. Many
faculty already disagree with how tenure and promotion works already upon our campus.
Adding new weights would only complicate the issue.

Centra believes very strongly in the evaluation of teaching and its effectiveness in
making significant improvements in teaching. Yet for this effectiveness to be met, four
conditions must be achieved, First of all,

"the teacher must learn something from the students that was not
already known. Secondly, the teacher must value the information.
Third, the teacher must know how or be advised about how to make
improvements. And fourth, the teacher must be motivated to make

So to truly get the results that one wants from any evaluation model, the
professors and other faculty must see the instrument as being beneficial and as a tool for
them to use and learn from. Concurrently, to achieve a working instrument, the professors
must be introduced to it gradually and must receive it prior to the initial test. This would
give them a chance to suggest changes, thereby alleviating many of the problems that
could occur from the lack of decision-making involvement of the faculty.
Even though faculty approval is of utmost importance, student approval should also be in high regard. Any person looking at the evaluation in any aspect must realize that even though "the major use of student ratings is to guide instructional improvements and faculty summarative evaluations, another use is to help students in their choice of courses and teachers" (Centra, 1979, p. 24). This becomes a touchy topic at times, and many professors feel that a student shouldn't have the choice to shop around for the right class. This could be a valid concern, but if the big picture is looked at, one can see that students need to be in a class in which they are not at a disadvantage.

Further objection can arise when looking at student-based evaluation instruments. Many times such sponsored evaluations "are based on ratings by small and non-representative samples of students or may emphasize some of the more critical comments about a teacher, regardless of how generalized such comments may be, thus leading many faculty members to object to student conducted course ratings" (Centra, 1979, p. 25).

This is a true statement as it pertains to Western, since the Western Student Association has attempted to use their evaluation instrument for the past five years showing little to no benefit. The reason is that instead of working with the faculty, they instead worked against them. The faculty then responded by not working with the Western Student Association and not supporting the system as a whole. In general, student-conducted evaluations such as the one that the Western Student Association provides can easily “antagonize professors even though on the whole students tend to be charitable in their criticism” (Dressel, 1976, p. 347).

So the circle continues and professors protest evaluation while students push for it. Professors, at times, seem to be afraid of evaluation in its entirety. Truthfully though,
“when professors argue that teaching cannot be evaluated, they mean that teaching should not be evaluated” (Seldin, 1984, p. 134). Seldin brings up a good question as he states, “Will the use of student ratings automatically lead to improved teaching? For most professors, probably not” (Seldin, 1984, p. 134). Even though this may be true, it is the final goal that can be hopefully achieved. It is a fact that student ratings are real and are for the most part valid, and if the faculty as a whole can see the good in such ratings, both faculty and students will benefit in the long run.

Review of Instruments

Preliminary research for the TSS was begun in February 1996. Universities around the country were contacted and asked for programs on their prospective campuses.

As the search for the perfect evaluation instrument began I was overwhelmed with information that could possibly be used in developing the actual instrument. By using such sources as the Westnet system, ERIC, the Resource Sharing Center, Evaluation Center, and the Academic Learning Center, I was able to find information that allowed me to come up with possible instruments that could be used.

Before looking at each individual instrument it should be known that there is “no one method by itself that is adequate. In fact, overemphasis on one method, may do more harm than good” (Dressel, 1976, p. 338). Even though these methods were not chosen to represent the new instrument that was developed, they were used in a constructive way, allowing me to pull out the positive aspects and place those aspects into the new model. Factors that I took into consideration included: cost of implementation, length and
complexity of evaluation form, along with the usage of opinion-based questions.

Something to think about is that “there is no perfect evaluation program, nor can there be. Such a system will probably always remain beyond reach. But with enough time, effort, and goodwill, we can come reasonably close” (Seldin, 1984, p. 156). Yet this statement is very good to keep in mind while looking at the descriptions of the pro’s and con’s of the following instruments. (The following information is located in Centra, 1993, p. 179-213)

Name: Instructional Assessment System (IAS)

Description: The IAS consists of “nine distinct forms, each tailored to provide diagnostic information for a broad course type”

Pro’s / Con’s: Evaluation can be expensive with a cost for each survey form

Name: Instructor and Course Evaluation (ICE)

Description: This form is processed through FORTRAN programs on an IBM computer to provide instructor summaries on fifty-six standard items and eighteen optional items.

Pro’s / Con’s: With such a large number of questions for others to answer, a whole class period would be lost to the filling out of the evaluation. Also, with the processing of the form using FORTRAN, the person running the evaluation would have to be knowledgeable with that language.

Name: Instructor and Course Evaluation System (ICES)
**Description:** A computer-based system in which faculty can select items from a catalogue of more than 400 items classified by content (by course management, student outcomes, instructor characteristics and style, instructional environment, student preferences, and settings) and by specificity (global, general concept and specific).

**Pro's / Con's:** If all professors can choose their own items to be evaluated on, there would be little continuity between professors and moreover there would be no way to tie departmental results together. So then professors cannot see how their results compared with their colleagues. Another weakness is the cost of the program, with each student questionnaire costing $.27 (on orders of five thousand or more), catalogues costing $1.00, and the remaining newsletters at $.25, all of which would be expensive.

**Name:** Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (IDEA) System

**Description:** IDEA uses students' ratings of progress on ten course goals selected as "important" or "essential" by the instructor. (see Appendix 1)

**Pro's / Con's:** This instrument is widely used, the 1992-1993 database includes 104,237 classes from 135 colleges and universities selected from a pool of more than 140,000 classes from 257 institutions. IDEA is much like the departmental evaluations that are now used at Western, but the form is somewhat longer, and again the professors are able to choose their "goals."

**Name:** Student Instructional Report (SIR)

**Description:** The SIR includes a machine-scorable answer sheet with thirty-nine
questions, plus space for responses to ten additional questions that may be inserted individually. SIR covers such areas as instructor-student interaction, tests and exams, course organization, student interest, and course challenge. (See Appendix 2)

Pro's / Con's: The SIR is very similar to what is already used within the different departments at Western. The number of questions again is a topic of concern, the more questions the more time it takes students to fill out. On a positive note, the SIR is relatively cheaper than other instruments.

Name: Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS)

Description: SIRS is a means of collecting, analyzing, displaying, and interpreting student reactions to classroom instruction and course content. SIRS is designed to assess student reactions to provide feedback for use in instructional improvement and in administrative decisions regarding instructors. The form contains twenty items on five factors: instructor involvement, student interest, student-instructor interaction, course demands, and course organization. This form is available through Michigan State University. (See Appendix 3)

Pro's / Con's: SIRS is much shorter than most of the previous ones, which is definitely a positive aspect. The problems arise from "opinion" questions that are throughout the entire questionnaire. At least on Western's campus "opinion" questions are controversial. Other than that, the SIRS is basically a good evaluation instrument in my opinion.
**Name:** Purdue’s Cafeteria System

**Description:** Purdue’s Cafeteria System consists of four FORTRAN computer programs, a two hundred-page operations manual, a computer-managed catalogue containing two hundred diagnostic items, and a norm library. (See Appendix 4)

**Pro’s / Con’s:** The entire form is based upon opinion-based questions, which at times can give misleading results to the professor. Also, the program is quite costly, with an initial one-time fee of $955 and each student evaluator form costing approximately $.34. The entire program is run on FORTRAN, so the evaluators would have to have some person with knowledge of that computer language. The only good thing that I noticed about this evaluation instrument was that it was the first documented evaluation instrument, developed in 1927 by Herman H. Remmers. And proof of its existence today shows that it has worked.

**Name:** Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) Instrument

**Description:** Questions are broken down into nine different areas including: Learning/Academic Value, Instructor Enthusiasm, Organization/Clarity, Breadth of Coverage, Examinations/Grading, Assignments/Readings, Group Interaction, Individual Rapport, Overall Rating, and a Background Subject/Class Characteristics section. (See Appendix 5)

**Pro’s / Con’s:** I was impressed with inclusion of the Background Subject/Class Characteristics section. This was the first evaluation instrument that tried to make a correlation between ratings and a students’ background.
Though I found this to be positive, the instrument consists mainly of opinion-based questions.

In addition to the Centra source, I obtained instruments through collections, as well as from people in different universities. (the following instruments are located in Doyle 100-112)

**Name:** Student Opinion Survey

**Description:** This form is from the University of Minnesota. The evaluation system is broken down into four forms including: general information, supplemental information, and reading materials. (See Appendix 6)

**Pros / Cons:** With three forms the evaluator may have a problem with the collection of the forms. This form also bases much of its results on opinion-based questions.

**Name:** Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses

**Description:** This form is used at Kansas State University. There are two forms for the evaluation, a long form and a short form (the short form is shown in Appendix 7). On the short form are thirty-six questions that students answer. The questionnaire is split up into four sections including: instructors teaching procedures, comparing the course with others the student has taken, comparing the progress the student has made in the course compared to that made in other courses, and the students’ personal attitudes and behaviors in the course in question.
**Pros / Cons:** The instrument is a blend of opinion and factual questions.

I did not like the rating levels in the third section regarding the comparison of the students’ progress made in the course compared with other courses. This was due to the fact that the student is asked to rate the class by a percentage, i.e. lowest 10% to upper 10%. This type of rating can lead to a type of competition between the professors. So instead of teaching the students so that they will learn they are teaching in a way to please their students, to receive positive ratings.

**Name:** Course Evaluation - Princeton University

**Description:** This instrument is broken down into eight sections for the student to answer. These eight sections include: lectures; readings; precepts of classes; papers, reports and problem sets; laboratories; seminars; language courses; and overall ratings. The questionnaire also has approximately 41 questions on it.

**Pros / Cons:** This program has a blend of factual and opinion-based questions. The number of questions is somewhat high.

I also found two examples of instruments from the 1960’s. The first is found in (Schmidt, 1968, p. 4-5), and the second is found in (Overturf, 1966, p. 15).

**Name:** Palomar College Course Rating Sheet

**Description:** This instrument is broken down into three sections: content, presentation,
and assignments. There are approximately 21 questions on the entire questionnaire, tabulated by scantron (See Appendix 8).

**Pros / Cons:** This instrument used few opinionated questions and based most of the questions on factual information pertaining to the course in general. The set up of the form was too busy, with three letter abbreviations preceding each of the questions. In general, for an instrument that was being used in 1968, it seems to be an effective one.

**Name:** Student Rating of Instructor

**Description:** This instrument from Saint Johns River Junior College in Palatka, Florida was broken down into four sections including: positive personal traits, knowledge, class participation, and evaluation of students. It was based on a five point scale, with superior being five and poor being one (See Appendix 9).

**Pros / Cons:** The entire form is subject to the opinion of the student who is evaluating the professor. Each of the four areas has a small description underneath which explain the areas. These explanations have nothing to do with the class, but the professor and his/her own tendencies such as: appearance or understanding. This is not one of the top better instruments.

The next few entries were collected directly from the colleges/universities. For more specific information refer to the bibliography.

**Name:** 1990-1991 Student Ratings of Instructors and Courses

**Description:** This form is from Eastern Michigan University. It is a very short form
with only twelve questions. (See Appendix 10)

**Pros / Cons:** The entire instrument, is based on opinion questions such as; “My instructor stimulates interest in the course” and similar questions. I don’t believe accurate results could be obtained with this model. Also, the data in the book itself is very difficult to comprehend unless you have a guide to the results right in front of you.

**Name:** The Best Professors at the University of Wisconsin as chosen by the students

**Description:** This instrument uses eight questions that the students answer. The answers are then compiled and the highest scorers are praised for their achievement. (See Appendix 11)

**Pros / Cons:** All of the questions used are based on opinion which can be easily swayed. I do like the quotes from the professors.

**Name:** Undergraduate Course Guide 1995

**Description:** The actual form that the students use was absent from the booklet that I received from the University of Pennsylvania, but the book itself is quite impressive. This 618 page book is broken down into classes that the university offers. Underneath the actual scores of the individual professors that teach the course is a explanation of the course in general, and then reactions of students that have taken the course with the different professors listed. (See Appendix 12)

**Pros / Cons:** I really enjoyed looking through this book that was developed. I liked the set up of the textual
information and also how the actual scores for the professors were reported. I also liked two sections that were included at the end of the book, entitled Notable Courses and Professors and the other section was called Notable Quotables.

**Name:** The Source Guide

**Description:** This is another book that was missing the actual evaluation form, but was much like the PENN guide. The book consists of 573 pages and is separated into academic departments in the respective colleges within Boston University. The ratings are broken down into two categories, one dealing with the course and one dealing with the instructor. Topics within these areas include: (for the course) Workload Overall, Difficulty Overall, Overall Rating, (for the instructor) Enthusiasm Rating, Effectiveness Rating, Stimulates Interest, Available to Students, Overall Rating. (See Appendix 13)

**Pros / Cons:** This was another impressive book, broken down into factual information first, then course statistics, and finally student comments in which actual student comments were used to describe the professor in question. The statistics were easily understandable through a bar graph.

**Name:** Duke University Teacher Course Evaluation

**Description:** The format of the instrument is broken down into nine areas: Course, Instructor, Intellectual Stimulation, Demand Level, Materials, Evaluation
Methods, Classroom Dynamics, Adjective (pick one that describes the course), Additional Comments. Instead of using scantron for responses, all answers are written out by the students on a 1 to 4 scale. (See Appendix 14)

**Pros / Cons:** It would be a fairly good evaluation tool, but would be tedious to compile. The results are interesting and there is a score as well as a summary of the comments given by the students as a whole.

**The New Instrument:**

By reviewing all of the information from the above sources and eliminating questions that evaluated teacher competency, I believe that I was able to come up with a very beneficial and useful instrument. With the help of Dr. Loren Crane I concluded that probably the best approach was to evaluate the methods that a professor utilizes in teaching his/her course. Specifically, I decided to focus my instrument on the teaching styles of the individual instructors, thereby getting rid of any threatening connotations from the previous instrument.

While deciding on this method of evaluation I realized that there were going to be several key things to implement this instrument such as obtaining: “the active support and involvement of top-level administrators... and seek widespread faculty involvement in every step of the program’s development. It is essential for faculty members to believe they control their own destiny”(Seldin, 1984, p. 156). So to accomplish this, I wrote a letter to a wide variety of professors at Western. (See Appendix 15) I felt that giving the
professors a chance for input was a very important step in the overall process of implementing the instrument. Their concerns that would be returned would be duly noted and I would then try to accommodate them in the further development of the instrument.

On the next page is the instrument as it now stands. Following the instrument will be a description of the logic that went into the development of the instrument and how the questions deal with the teaching styles of professors and the learning styles of students.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
TEACHING STYLE SURVEY

*1* This is not an evaluation of competence nor popularity.

*2* This is a description of teaching style & class management methods.

Course ___________________ Instructor ___________________

*3* Class Activity (Circle the appropriate percentage)

*4* Lecture *8* 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
*5* Discussion 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
*6* Group Work 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
*7* Film, TV, Audio, etc. 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

*9* Must total 100%

*10* Thinking (Circle the appropriate percentage)

*11* Abstract (Conceptual) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
*12* Concrete (Memorization) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
*13* Practical (Application) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Must total 100%
When deciding to use teaching / learning style, I met with Cindy Overly, the director of the Academic Skills Center. With her help, I was able to find different resources that pertained to Learning Styles. With this new information I formed questions about learning styles: visual, auditory, and tactile. Knowing that each person is different, using different sides of their brain for different tasks (See Appendix 17), I had to be unbiased, not favoring one person over another. When looking through sources regarding learning styles, not all sources agreed when dealing with the amount or types of styles, some included Reading/Writing, Haptic, or Olfactory learning styles as well. Yet for the three that I was focusing on, I was able to find some valuable resources (See Appendix 17-18).

Now breaking down the new instrument into four categories: class activity, thinking, assignments, and testing, I was able to individually focus on major areas of importance regarding the class experience as a whole. All four of these areas used as a tool for students. The student will evaluate their professors by their teaching style.
In the first section, class activity, five subcategories were brought down to four, leaving out an initial individual work that I had originally listed. The four that were left satisfied all three of the learning styles that I was attempting to reach out at. Lecture satisfied the aural or auditory learner, and some visual would also be included in it as well. Discussion uses a combination of vocalic, auditory, and visual learning to satisfy the learner. Group work also uses a combination of auditory, visual and tactile learning along with vocalic learning to allow the student space to grow. Multimedia sources satisfy a multitude of different learning styles depending on the source which it comes from.

The second section dealing with thinking doesn’t simply deal with a simple learning style specifically. It deals with what side of the brain the learner depends on more often. The abstract thinker would depend on the left side of the brain. The concrete and practical thinkers would depend more strongly on the right side. This questioning is not to say that one way of using the brain is more effective in any way, but instead it is to be used as a tool for the students to be able to see what way a certain professor focuses his/her teaching style.

In the third section, assignment type was focused on. If the majority of the class assignments were reading or writing based, the more visual learner would probably excel to a higher level. Yet, if the majority of the assignments were project-based, the more tactile learner would excel, and if group work was present, the more auditory learner may be more likely to excel.

The final section was testing. If this instrument is to be used as a tool for the students, all of the base elements of information must be covered. In all of the sources
that I looked at regarding learning styles and brain usage, there was no correlation between testing type and style of the student in general.

All information that will be ultimately collected will be compiled and placed in a book that will be either sold for a minimum cost in the university bookstore, or will be given out to students at the university bookstore at no cost. This is the ultimate goal.

Instrument Changes

The instrument above, after being sent out to faculty senate members, was adapted many times to accommodate the differing opinions that were expressed by the faculty. Many of the changes were evident in the issue of the percentage of time as equaling 100%. After testing the original instrument it was evident that students also found the survey form to be difficult to understand and too time consuming. The following pages will present the progression of changes in the instrument, and changes in the letters that accompanied as they developed, the test?

On the following page is the instrument as it stands today. This instrument was developed after eight revisions. By looking at the * numbers on the previous instrument and comparing them to the updated instrument, one can see the evolution of the
instrument. The following list explains the changes and the rationale behind these changes:

1-2. These statements were descriptive and unnecessary. They did not help the participant in understanding what needed to be done. Instead, these statements merely explained what the survey was to be used for in general.

3. The category Class Activity was changed into two areas: Instructor Use of Class Time and Student Use of Class Time. These categories allowed for much more specific questions to be looked at. The narrow Class Activity gave but a minimal view of what someone could experience within the instruction of a professor. The new statements deal more with class time and how both the instructor and students utilize this time.

4. The category “Lecture” was changed to clarifying the statement saying, Instructor uses lecture.

5. The Category “Discussion” was changed to two different statements including: Instructor interacts with students, and also, Time in student group discussion. These changes followed the change from class activity to the two separate statements as discussed earlier.

6. The category “Group Work” was changed under another section and was labeled Group Project (lab, presentation). There was not much change in the actual purpose of the category, just the heading which the category was placed under.

7. Under the category “Film, TV, Audio, etc.”, this category was distributed
into the first two different areas described above. This category was renamed as statements such as: Instructor uses audio-visual equipment, and Time for in-class computer/equipment use. This was yet another change that was needed to see the difference between the students and instructors class time usage.

8-9 The zero to one hundred percent ranking was changed to ratings. This was changed due to the concerns of participants. Many found that it was very difficult to equal the one hundred percent that was asked in the first survey form. The ranges also aided in the clarity of the participants answers. Where before there was difficulty interpreting the scores, this clarified the participants responses.

10-13 The category “Thinking” was replaced with “Instructor Expectations of Students.” The “Thinking” category was found to be too complex of an issue for many participants to comprehend. Therefore the category was broken down into the five areas that exist today. These areas deal with the individual expectations that are prevalent within every classroom, with every professor.

14-17 The “Assignment” category was very similar to the original. The changes were additions to the list. The category name was changed to read “Course Assignments.” Changed was the “Writing” category. This was broadened to include both short and long papers. The “Project” category was also expanded to include both Individual and Group Projects. Expanding these areas
stemmed from an attempt to be all-inclusive, of courses taught on
WMU’s campus.

18-20 The category, “Testing” was changed to “Percentage of Grade
Determined By: .” From only two subcategories it was expanded
to six subcategories. This category was developed as a tool to
determine where the grades within the specific course were found.

Besides these areas, one other section was added. This section was entitled,
“Indicate Agreement / Disagreement with the following:” It was added to answer some
questions that were raised by many of the participants. These participants mentioned that
they wished for more information on areas of substance.
Your participation in filling out this survey is completely voluntary. You may even discontinue filling it out at any time without penalty. This survey is also completely anonymous.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
TEACHING STYLE SURVEY

Course _____________________ Instructor _______________________

Choose approximate percentage for each category. If a category does not apply mark NA. Mark each question on the answer form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR USE OF CLASS TIME</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT USE OF CLASS TIME</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Long paper(s) (5 + pages)</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF GRADE DETERMINED BY:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Attendance/participation</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Objective test(s) (T/F, MC, Fill in)</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assignments/projects</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATE AGREEMENT / DISAGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback to the Teaching Style Survey

After collecting the data for the Teaching Style Survey booklet and then publishing that data, booklets were sent out to participating professors, along with important administrators throughout the campus. The goal of this information gathering attempt was to collect data on the following questions:

1. Do you think that an instrument such as this will benefit students?  Y  N
2. Is the information contained in the survey useful to students?  Y  N
3. Could the data in the survey be misused?  Y  N
4. Do you think that this survey should be continued at WMU?  Y  N

There was also room for any additional comments.

The collection of this data was extremely helpful. It provided extra insight into how the faculty evaluated feel about the accuracy and validity of the survey itself. In the fifteen responses that were collected, it was found that the majority (80%) feel that the survey would both benefit and be useful for students. Of those that responded, only 40% felt that the data could be misused, but did not specify how. Responses on the last question, on whether or not the survey should be continued were varied. Some commented that it depended on how students felt about the survey in general. One of the responses alluded to the fact that the survey in their mind “was problematic unless a majority of professors participate.” I agree with this insight. For the instrument to be useful, a majority of professors from the campus community must participate, so the students can compare their
own learning style to the varied professors that may teach the courses that he/she must take to graduate.

Another response mentioned that they felt that the information gathered within the survey “could be accessed very easily from individual professors.” I disagree, it would not be easy to collect this information prior to selecting courses. Each student would have to meet with all of the professors teaching a certain course to collect the information, and the student would have no idea which professor would best fit his/her learning style.

These responses were helpful when attempting to understand the overall feelings and concerns of the faculty. The consensus was that the survey was good, there were very few negative comments received from the follow-up survey, and the negative comments that were collected were not about substantive issues.
The Future of the Teaching Style Survey

The future of the survey at Western Michigan University is in one word, doubtful. During the first implementation of the survey there were no problems with the faculty, AAUP or with the administration of the university. Yet, during the second testing of the survey there was a considerable change in the feelings expressed by the AAUP.

During the second implementation of the survey an electronic mail message was sent out to all WMU faculty members by the AAUP and was a faculty warning in regards to the Teaching Style Survey. This message claimed that the survey could be used by the administration if they wanted to fire an employee, and if this data was used, the AAUP stated that they could not back up any professor that participated in the survey. This message was followed up by an article in the AAUP Advocate (See Appendix 19). This article was published without any opportunity to respond, even though Loren Crane had asked to write a rebuttal to any article that was written. The article reinforced the electronic mail message that was sent out earlier. The most frustrating part of this situation was the fact that the AAUP did not contact me at any point to speak to me about the project. The interference of the AAUP made a definite impact on the results that were collected.

When looking at the difference between the first and second implementation, the same letter was sent to the same sample size (1000 letters to full time faculty of all
academic departments at WMU). Yet there was a distinct change between the first and second implementations of the survey. In the first, twenty-four responses were collected, while in the second, there were only four. This drastic change in numbers makes me believe that the AAUP response to the survey negatively influenced the thinking of the professors.

There is a distinct paranoia that seems to be embedded in the minds of some professors in regards to teacher evaluation. This is especially true at WMU, where there is opposition to even the departmental evaluations that are required by faculty members. As long as this paranoia persists, a non-evaluative instrument such as the Teaching Style Survey will be unable to gain any faculty recognition as credible and accurate. The survey’s future lies in the minds of the participants, the professors and the students. The students are the main focus of this survey. It is for their knowledge that the survey was initially developed, and it will be the students that in the end will continue or end the Teaching Style Survey.
Appendix 1

IDEA Survey Form
### IDEA Survey Form - Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses

**Describe the frequency of your instructor's teaching procedures, using the following code:**

- 1 - Hardly Ever
- 2 - Occasionally
- 3 - Sometimes
- 4 - Frequently
- 5 - Almost Always

#### The Instructor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted teacher-student discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found ways to help students answer their own questions.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged students to express themselves freely and openly.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seemed enthusiastic about the subject matter.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed approaches to meet new situations.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave examinations which stressed unnecessary memorization.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke with expressiveness and variety in tone of voice.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made presentations which were dry and dull.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained the reasons for criticisms of students' academic performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave examination questions which were unclear.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged student comments even when they turned out to be incorrect or irrelevant.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized material in a manner which aided retention.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly stated the objectives of the course.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained course material clearly, and explanations were to the point.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related course material to real-life situations.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave examination questions which were unreasonably detailed (picky).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Progress on:

- Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)
- Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
- Learning to apply course material to improve rational thinking, problem solving, and decision-making
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
- Learning how professionals in this field go about the process of gaining new knowledge (learning the mechanics of the course material for understanding and appreciating the intellectual and cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
- Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
- Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual and cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)

---

**On each of the objectives listed below, rate the progress you have made in this course compared with that made in other courses you have taken at this college or university.**

In this course my progress was:

- 1 - Low (lowest 10 percent of courses I have taken here)
- 2 - Low Average (next 20 percent of courses)
- 3 - Average (middle 40 percent of courses)
- 4 - High Average (next 20 percent of courses)
- 5 - High (highest 10 percent of courses)
On the next four questions, compare this course with others you have taken at this institution, using the following code:

1 - Much Less than Most Courses  
2 - Less than Most  
3 - About Average  
4 - More than Most  
5 - Much More than Most

The Course:
1. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Amount of reading.
2. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments.
3. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Difficulty of subject matter.
4. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Degree to which the course hung together (various topics and class activities were related to much other).

Describe your attitudes toward and behavior in this course, using the following code:
1 - Definitely False  
2 - More False than True  
3 - In Between  
4 - More True than False  
5 - Definitely True

Self-rating:
1. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] I worked harder on this course than on most courses I have taken.
2. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] I had a strong desire to take this course.
3. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] I would like to take another course from this instructor.
4. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study.
5. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Leave this space blank. Continue with question A.

For the following questions, A-G, indicate how descriptive each statement is by blackening the proper space.
1 - Definitely False  
2 - More False than True  
3 - In Between  
4 - More True than False  
5 - Definitely True

A. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] The instructor gave tests, projects, etc., that covered IMPORTANT POINTS of the course.
B. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] The instructor gave projects, tests, or assignments that required ORIGINAL OR CREATIVE THINKING.
C. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] I really wanted to take a course FROM THIS INSTRUCTOR.
D. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] I really wanted to take this course REGARDLESS OF WHO TAUGHT IT.
E. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Overall, I rate this INSTRUCTOR an excellent teacher.
F. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Overall, I rate this an excellent COURSE.
G. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Overall, I LEARNED A GREAT DEAL in this course.

EXTRA QUESTIONS:
If your instructor has extra questions, answer them in the space designated below (questions 40-64).

Your comments are invited on how the instructor might improve this course or teaching procedures. Use the space below for comments (unless otherwise directed.)

Note: Your written comments will be returned to the instructor. You may want to PRINT to protect your anonymity.

Institution: 
Instructor: 
Course No.: 
Time and Days Class Meets: 
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SIR Survey Form
STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT

This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to express anonymously your views of this course and the way it has been taught. Indicate the response closest to your view by filling in the appropriate circle. Use a soft lead pencil (No. 2) for all responses to the questionnaire. Do not use a pen (ink, ball-point, or felt-tip).

SECTION I. Items 1-20. Fill in one response number for each question.

NA (0) = Not Applicable or don't know. The statement does not apply to this course or instructor, or you simply are not able to give a knowledgeable response.
SA (4) = Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
A (3) = Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
D (2) = Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
SD (1) = Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.

1. The instructor's objectives for the course have been made clear
2. There was considerable agreement between the announced objectives of the course and what was actually taught
3. The instructor used class time well
4. The instructor was readily available for consultation with students
5. The instructor seemed to know when students didn't understand the material
6. Lectures were too repetitive of what was in the textbook(s)
7. The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves
8. The instructor seemed genuinely concerned with students' progress and was actively helpful
9. The instructor made helpful comments on papers or exams
10. The instructor raised challenging questions or problems for discussion
11. In this class I felt free to ask questions or express my opinions
12. The instructor was well prepared for each class
13. The instructor told students how they would be evaluated in the course
14. The instructor summarized or emphasized major points in lectures or discussions
15. My interest in the subject area has been stimulated by this course
16. The scope of the course has been too limited; not enough material has been covered
17. Examinations reflected the important aspects of the course
18. I have been putting a good deal of effort into this course
19. The instructor was open to other viewpoints
20. In my opinion, the instructor has accomplished (is accomplishing) his or her objectives for the course

SECTION II. Items 21-31. Fill in one response number for each question.

21. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was:
22. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was:
23. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was:
24. The instructor used examples or illustrations to help clarify the material:
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Questionnaire continued on the other side.
25. Was class rate satisfactory for the method of conducting the class?
   1. Yes, most of the time
   2. No, class was too large
   3. No, class was too small
   4. It didn't make any difference one way or the other

26. Which one of the following best describes the course for you?
   1. Major requirement or elective within major field
   2. Minor requirement or elective outside major field
   3. College requirement but not part of my major or minor field
   4. Elective not required in any way
   5. Other

27. Which one of the following was your most important reason for selecting this course?
   1. Friend(s) recommended it
   2. Faculty advisor's recommendation
   3. Teacher's excellent reputation
   4. Thought I could make a good grade
   5. Could use pass/no credit option
   6. It was required
   7. Subject was of interest
   8. Other

28. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
   1. A
   2. B
   3. C
   4. D
   5. F
   6. Other

29. What is your approximate cumulative grade-point average?
   1. 4.00-4.00
   2. 3.50-3.99
   3. 3.00-3.49
   4. 2.50-2.99
   5. 2.00-2.49
   6. 1.50-1.99
   7. 1.00-1.49
   8. Less than 1.00
   9. None yet - first year or transfer
   10. Other

30. What is your class level?
   1. Freshman
   2. Sophomore
   3. Graduate
   4. Junior
   5. Senior
   6. Other

31. Sex:
   1. Female
   2. Male

SECTION III Items 32-39. Fill in one response number for each question.

32. Overall, I would rate the textbook(s)...
33. Overall, I would rate the supplementary readings...
34. Overall, I would rate the quality of the exams...
35. I would rate the general quality of the lectures...
36. I would rate the overall value of class discussions...
37. Overall, I would rate the laboratories...
38. I would rate the overall value of this course to me as...
39. How would you rate the quality of instruction in this course? (Try to set aside your feelings about the course itself.) Fill in one response number.

Excellent 0 0 0 0 0 0
Good 0 0 0 0 0 0
About Average 0 0 0 0 0 0
Fair 0 0 0 0 0 0
Poor 0 0 0 0 0 0

SECTION IV. Items 40-49. If the instructor provided supplementary questions and response options, use this section for responding. Fill in only one response number for each question.

If you would like to make additional comments about the course or instruction, use a separate sheet of paper. You might elaborate on the particular aspects you liked most as well as those you liked least. Also, how can the course or the way it was taught be improved? PLEASE GIVE THESE COMMENTS TO THE INSTRUCTOR.

If you have any comments, suggestions, or complaints about this questionnaire (for example, the content or responses available), please send them to: Student Instructional Report, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08541.
Appendix 3

Michigan State University Student Instructional Rating System
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL RATING SYSTEM

Your instructor hopes to use your thoughtful responses for the improvement of instruction. Please omit any of the items which do not pertain to the course that you are rating. With a number 2 pencil, respond to the items using the KEY.

1. The instructor’s enthusiasm when presenting course material
2. The instructor’s interest in teaching
3. The instructor’s use of examples or personal experiences to help get points across in class
4. The instructor’s concern with whether the students learned the material
5. Your interest in learning the course material
6. Your general attentiveness in class
7. The course as an intellectual challenge
8. Improvement in your competence in the area due to this course
9. The instructor’s encouragement to students to express opinions
10. The instructor’s receptiveness to new ideas and others’ viewpoints
11. The student’s opportunity to ask questions
12. The instructor’s stimulation of class discussion
13. The appropriateness of the amount of material the instructor attempted to cover
14. The appropriateness of the pace at which the instructor attempted to cover the material
15. The contribution of homework assignments to your understanding of the course material relative to the amount of time required
16. The appropriateness of the difficulty of assigned reading topics
17. The instructor’s ability to relate the course concepts in a systematic manner
18. The course organization
19. The ease of taking notes on the instructor’s presentation
20. The adequacy of the outlined direction of the course
21. Your general enjoyment of the course

STUDENT BACKGROUND: Select the most appropriate alternative.
22. Was this course required in your degree program?
23. What is your sex?
24. What is your overall GPA? (a) 1.9 or less (b) 2.0-2.2 (c) 2.3-2.7
   (d) 2.8-3.3 (e) 3.4-4.0
25. What is your class level? (a) Freshman (b) Sophomore (c) Junior
   (d) Senior (e) Graduate or other

S - SUPERIOR: exceptionally good course or instructor
AA - ABOVE AVERAGE: better than the typical course or instructor
AV - AVERAGE: typical of courses or instructors
BA - BELOW AVERAGE: not as good as the typical course or instructor
I - INFERIOR: exceptionally poor course or instructor

The Michigan State University Code of Teaching Responsibility holds all instructors to certain obligations with respect to, e.g., course content consistent with approved descriptions, timely statement of course objectives and grading criteria, regular class attendance, published office hours, and timely return of examinations and term papers. This Code is printed in full in the Schedule of Courses and Academic Handbook. It includes specifics about complaint procedures available to students who believe that their instructors have violated the Code.
Appendix 4

Purdue Instructor and Course Appraisal
INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE APPRAISAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR'S NAME</th>
<th>COURSE TITLE AND NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PLEASE RESPOND TO ANY ITEMS IN this section by marking the appropriate spaces. Use pencil only. Tracing or erasures are not permitted. Use appropriate spaces only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMAN</td>
<td>PASS/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>FAIL/F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY. Then select one of these five alternatives: STRONGLY AGREE (SA), AGREE (A), UNDECIDED (U), DISAGREE (D), STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I UNDERSTAND EASILY WHAT MY INSTRUCTOR IS SAYING.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULT TOPICS ARE STRUCTURED IN EASILY UNDERSTOOD WAYS.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR SPEAKS AUDIBLY AND CLEARLY.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COURSE SUPPLIES ME WITH AN EFFECTIVE RANGE OF CHALLENGES.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THIS COURSE, I ALWAYS FELT CHALLENGED AND MOTIVATED TO LEARN.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COURSE MOTIVATES ME TO TAKE ADDITIONAL RELATED COURSES.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COURSE FOSTERS RESPECT FOR NEW POINTS OF VIEW.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COURSE HAS EFFECTIVELY CHALLENGED ME TO THINK.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS AMONG COURSE TOPICS ARE CLEARLY EXPLAINED.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COURSE BUILDS UNDERSTANDING OF CONCEPTS AND PRINCIPLES.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR EVALUATES OFTEN AND PROVIDES HELP WHERE NEEDED.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR APPEARS TO GRASP QUICKLY WHAT A STUDENT IS SAYING.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR IS CAREFUL AND PRECISE WHEN ANSWERING QUESTIONS.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COURSE SHOWS A SENSITIVITY TO INDIVIDUAL INTERESTS/ABILITIES.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS PROCEED AT THEIR OWN PACE IN THIS COURSE.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACH STUDENT IS ENCOURAGED TO CONTRIBUTE TO CLASS LEARNING.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I FEEL THAT I AM AN IMPORTANT MEMBER OF THIS CLASS.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I AM FREE TO EXPRESS AND EXPLAIN MY OWN VIEWS IN CLASS.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR DEALS FAIRLY AND IMPARTIALLY WITH ME.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CLIMATE OF THIS CLASS IS CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE OBJECTIVES OF THIS COURSE WERE CLEARLY EXPLAINED TO ME.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I WAS ABLE TO SET AND ACHIEVE SOME OF MY OWN GOALS.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE COURSE CONTENT IS CONSISTENT WITH MY PRIOR EXPECTATIONS.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE OBJECTIVES ALLOW ME TO KNOW WHEN I AM MAKING PROGRESS.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COURSE INCLUDES ADEQUATE INFORMATION ON CAREER OPPORTUNITIES.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE RELATIONSHIP OF THIS COURSE TO MY EDUCATION IS APPARENT.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE REAL STRENGTH OF THIS COURSE IS THE CLASSROOM DISCUSSION.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPS CLASSROOM DISCUSSION SKILLFULLY.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY FINAL GRADE WILL ACCURATELY REFLECT MY OVERALL PERFORMANCE.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR HAS A REALISTIC DEFINITION OF GOOD PERFORMANCE.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE TOPICS ARE DEALT WITH IN SUFFICIENT DEPTH.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I PUT A GOOD DEAL OF EFFORT INTO THIS COURSE.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I FIND THE COURSE EMPHASIS ON INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS STIMULATING.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I AM SATISFIED WITH MY ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THIS COURSE.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESE ITEMS LET ME APPRAISE THIS COURSE FULLY AND FAIRLY.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR MOTIVATES ME TO DO MY BEST WORK.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY INSTRUCTOR EXPLAINS DIFFICULT TOPICS AND MATERIAL CLEARLY.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE ASSIGNMENTS ARE INTERESTING AND STIMULATING.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL, THIS COURSE IS AMONG THE BEST I HAVE TAKEN.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL, THIS INSTRUCTOR IS AMONG THE BEST TEACHERS I HAVE KNOWN.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON ANOTHER SHEET, DESCRIBE WHAT YOU LIKED BEST ABOUT THIS COURSE.

ON ANOTHER SHEET, DESCRIBE WHAT YOU LIKED LEAST ABOUT THIS COURSE.

WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WOULD YOU RECOMMEND FOR THIS COURSE?
Appendix 5

Students' Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ)
STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY (SEEQ)

Do not put your name on this survey. Please complete it as accurately and as candidly as possible. This is part of a larger project to improve teaching effectiveness at the University. The purpose of this survey is to provide your lecturer with feedback about his/her teaching effectiveness. For this reason you should base your responses on his/her teaching in this subject. If any items are not applicable simply put NA in the corresponding blank.

Please indicate the EXTENT of your agreement/disagreement with the following statements as descriptions of this subject by using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEARNING/ACADEMIC VALUE

- You found the class intellectually challenging and stimulating.
- You have learned something which you considered valuable.
- Your interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this class.
- You have learned and understood the subject materials in this class.

INSTRUCTOR ENTHUSIASM

- Lecturer was enthusiastic about teaching the class.
- Lecturer was dynamic and energetic in conducting the class.
- Lecturer enhanced presentations with the use of humour.
- Lecturer's style of presentation held your interest during class.

ORGANISATION/ClaRITY

- Lecturer's explanations were clear.
- Class materials were well prepared and carefully explained.
- Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so you knew where the class was going.
- Lecturer gave presentations that facilitated taking notes.

GROU P INTERACTION

- Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions.
- Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge.
- Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers.
- Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the lecturer.

INDIVIDUAL RAPPORT

- Lecturer was friendly towards individual students.
- Lecturer had a genuine interest in individual students.

BACKGROUND SUBJECT/CLASS CHARACTERISTICS

- Subject difficulty, relative to other subjects, was (1 - Very Easy, 2 - Easy, 3 - Medium, 4 - Hard, 5 - Very Hard).
- Subject workload, relative to other subjects, was (1 - Very Light, 2 - Light, 3 - Medium, 4 - Heavy, 5 - Very Heavy).
- Subject pace was (1 - Too slow, 2 - About Right, 3 - Too Fast).
- Average number of hours per week required outside of class (0-10 hours, 11-20 hours, etc.).
- Gender (1 - Male, 2 - Female).
- Your expected subject mark: (1 - Fail, 2 - Pass, 3 - Credit, 4 - Dist, 5 - High Dist, 6 - Other).
- Your marks in previous university subjects (1 - Mostly Passes, 2 - Mostly Passes with few Credits, 3 - Mostly Passes with few Distinctions, 4 - Mostly Credits, 5 - Mostly Distinctions and High Distinctions, NA - no previous marks).
- In comparison with other subjects at this institution, how easy is it to get good marks in this subject? (1 - Very Easy, 2 - Easy, 3 - About Average, 4 - Difficult, 5 - Very Difficult).
- Course (1 - Assoc Dip, 2 - Undergrad Dip, 3 - Undergrad Degree, 4 - Grad Dip, 5 - Masters, 6 - PhD, 7 - Other).
- Level of interest in the subject before the start of the class (1 - Very Low, 2 - Low, 3 - Medium, 4 - High, 5 - Very High).
- Year in Course (1 - 1st, 2 - 2nd, 3 - 3rd, 4 - 4th).
- Your School (1 - Arts & Gen Stud, 2 - Bus & Tech, 3 - Educ & Lang, 4 - Comm & Welf, 5 - Nursing, 6 - Other).

LECTURER-SUPPLIED QUESTIONS (leave blank if no additional questions are provided)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16.

Please Turn Over

© 1978, 1991 Professor Herbert W. Marsh
OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

Your written comments will be returned to your lecturer. If you have concerns for your anonymity, please print your comments.

Please indicate the important characteristics of this lecturer/class that have been most valuable to your overall learning experience.

1. 

2. 

3. 

Please indicate characteristics of this lecturer/class that you feel are most important for him/her to improve (particularly aspects not covered by the rating items):

1. 

2. 

3. 

Please use the additional space to clarify any of your responses or to make other comments.
Appendix 6

Student Opinion Survey
STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to share your views about certain aspects of this course with your instructor. For each item below, please indicate the response closest to your opinion by circling the appropriate number. Please circle only one number for each item. Thank you for your help.

measurement services center
9 clarence avenue s.e. minneapolis, minnesota 55414

GENERAL

The INSTRUCTOR:

1. clearly presented the subject matter.
2. was approachable.
3. got me interested in her/his subject.
4. raised challenging questions.
5. when appropriate, related course material to other areas of knowledge.

The READING MATERIAL—including the textbook:

6. held my attention easily.
7. was clearly written.
8. served well the purpose for which it was intended.

The TESTS:

9. concentrated on the important points and topics in the subject matter.
10. seemed to have been carefully and conscientiously prepared.
11. were about the right length.
12. were clearly worded.
13. seemed to be good measures of my knowledge and understanding.

In GENERAL:

14. procedures for determining grades were appropriate for this course.
15. the amount of work required was appropriate for the number of credits offered.
16. adequate information about how well I was doing was readily available.
17. adequate help was available when I needed it.
18. my responsibilities in the course were clearly defined.

©1973, 1974 University of Minnesota. Reprinted by permission. For further information contact Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota, 9 Clarence Avenue S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414.
19. How much did you like the SUBJECT MATTER of the course, forgetting about the instructor?

- 1: Disliked Intensely
- 2: Disliked Greatly
- 3: Disliked Somewhat
- 4: Liked Somewhat
- 5: Liked A Lot
- 6: Liked Very Much
- 7: Liked Exceptionally Well

20. How much did you like this instructor AS A PERSON?

- 1: Disliked Intensely
- 2: Disliked Considerably
- 3: Disliked Somewhat
- 4: Liked Somewhat
- 5: Liked A Lot
- 6: Liked Very Much
- 7: Liked Exceptionally Well

21. How would you rate this instructor's OVERALL TEACHING ABILITY?

- 1: Very Poor
- 2: Poor
- 3: Fair
- 4: Good
- 5: Very Good
- 6: Exceptionally Good

22. How much would you say you LEARNED from this instructor?

- 1: Almost Nothing
- 2: Little
- 3: A Fair Amount
- 4: More
- 5: Much
- 6: Very Much
- 7: An Exceptional Amount

23. How much EFFORT did you put into this course?

- 1: Almost None
- 2: Little
- 3: A Fair Amount
- 4: Much
- 5: Very Much
- 6: An Exceptional Amount

24. In which YEAR in school are you?

- 1: Freshman
- 2: Sophomore
- 3: Junior
- 4: Senior
- 5: Graduate
- 6: Adult
- 7: Special

25. Was this specific course REQUIRED of you?

- 1: Yes
- 2: No

26. What is your overall cumulative GRADE-POINT AVERAGE at the University of Minnesota?

- 1: 2.0 or Below
- 2: 2.1-2.5
- 3: 2.6-3.0
- 4: 3.1-3.5
- 5: 3.6-4.0

27. Which SEX are you?

- 1: Female
- 2: Male

Your instructor may provide some additional questions. If so, please use this section to answer them. If not, please leave this section blank.

28. __________________________

29. __________________________

30. __________________________

31. __________________________

32. __________________________

33. __________________________

34. __________________________

35. __________________________
STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to evaluate this course in your own words and to offer recommendations for its improvement. Please be frank, specific, and constructive.

SUPPLEMENT

measurement services center
9 clarence avenue s.e., minneapolis, minnesota 55414

1. Please describe yourself in order to give your instructor an idea of your point of view:

Major __________________ GPA __________________
Year in School ______________ Grading Option: A-N S-N Other
Vocational/Educational Plans: ________________________________________

2. For what reasons did you take this course?

©1973, 1974 University of Minnesota. Reprinted by permission. For further information contact Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota, 9 Clarence Avenue S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414.
3. How much and in what ways do you feel this course has contributed to your education?

4. Please comment on the following characteristics of the instructor as they enhanced or detracted from the course:

   His/her grasp of the material

   Communication skills

   Attitudes toward students
5. What things about this course or instructor particularly heightened or diminished your motivation really to 'get into' the subject matter?

6. Please comment briefly on the particular strengths and/or weaknesses of any or all of the following as they relate to your experience in this course or to what you got out of it:

Reading Material

Tests

Handouts

Written Assignments

Teaching Assistant(s)

Other Students

Yourself
7. What were the most satisfying things about the course and the instructor?
The most disappointing?

8. Please make any further evaluative comments or suggestions for improvement here.

Thanks for your help.
STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

READING MATERIALS

This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to share your views about the reading materials used in this course. For each item below, please indicate the response closest to your opinion by circling the appropriate number. Please circle only one number for each item.

Thanks for your help.

Please continue on the other side.

© 1973, 1974 University of Minnesota. Reprinted by permission. For further information contact Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota, 9 Clarence Avenue S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414.
16. Of the reading for this course that was scheduled to have been completed by now, how much have you finished?

1 Very Little
2 Less Than Half
3 About Half
4 More Than Half
5 Almost All

17. Compared to your level of interest before you did this reading, did these materials increase or decrease your interest in the subject matter?

1 Decreased Much
2 Decreased Somewhat
3 Left the Same
4 Increased Somewhat
5 Increased Much

18. In which YEAR in school are you?

1 Freshman
2 Sophomore
3 Junior
4 Senior
5 Graduate
6 Adult Special

19. Was this specific course REQUIRED of you?

1 Yes
2 No

20. What is your cumulative GRADE-POINT AVERAGE at the University of Minnesota?

1 2.0 or below
2 2.1-2.5
3 2.6-3.0
4 3.1-3.5
5 3.6-4.0

21. Under which GRADING OPTION are you taking this course?

1 A-N
2 S-N
3 Other

22. Which SEX are you?

1 Female
2 Male

---

Your instructor may provide some additional questions. If so, please use this section to answer them. If not, please leave this section blank.

23. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please add any further evaluative comments or constructive suggestions about the reading materials.
The Instructor:

1. Is concerned about the effectiveness of his teaching.  
2. Is genuinely interested in students.  
3. Is well informed on the material presented.  
4. Clearly indicates what material tests will cover.  
5. Stimulates curiosity about the subject matter.  
6. Has an interesting style of presentation.  
7. Organizes his lectures well.  
8. Clearly interprets abstract ideas and theories.  
9. Attempts to stimulate creative abilities.  
10. Keeps the course moving rapidly enough for the material.  
11. Makes good use of examples and illustrations.  
12. Relates the material of this course with other areas of knowledge.  
13. Presents or allows various points of view.  
14. Discusses recent developments in the field.  
15. Is aware when students are having difficulty in understanding a topic.  
16. Makes it clear how each topic fits into the course.  
17. Gives explanations which are clear and to the point.  
18. Welcomes questions from students.  
19. Is available for individual help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Instructor:</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is concerned about the effectiveness of his teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is genuinely interested in students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is well informed on the material presented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clearly indicates what material tests will cover.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stimulates curiosity about the subject matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has an interesting style of presentation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Organizes his lectures well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clearly interprets abstract ideas and theories.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attempts to stimulate creative abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Keeps the course moving rapidly enough for the material.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Makes good use of examples and illustrations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Relates the material of this course with other areas of knowledge.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Presents or allows various points of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Discusses recent developments in the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is aware when students are having difficulty in understanding a topic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Makes it clear how each topic fits into the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gives explanations which are clear and to the point.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Welcomes questions from students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Is available for individual help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Instructor:

20. Clearly defines student responsibilities in the course.
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

21. Demands a reasonable amount of work.
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

22. Invites criticism of his own ideas.
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

23. Is enthusiastic about his subject.
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

24. Is humorous at appropriate times.
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

25. Gives adequate information during the course regarding student progress through quizzes, tests or other feedback.
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

26. Encourages class discussion.
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

Please use items 27 through 31 for responding to any items specially developed by the instructor.

27. 
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

28. 
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

29. 
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

30. 
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

31. 
   - Frequency: 1 2 3 4 5
   - Importance: 1 2 3 4 5

For Items 32 through 38, please circle the number of the appropriate response. Circle only one number for each item.

32. What is the overall value of this course to you?
   - Not Valuable: 1
   - Valuable: 2
   - Very Valuable: 3
   - Valuable: 4
   - Extremely Valuable: 5

33. Which sex are you?
   1. Male
   2. Female

34. Which of the following apply to you?
   1. Freshman
   2. Sophomore
   3. Junior
   4. Senior
   5. Graduate Student
   6. Adult Special
   7. Other

35. What is your overall cumulative grade point average (CFA)?
   1. 1.99 or less
   2. 2.00 - 2.50
   3. 2.51 - 3.00
   4. 3.01 - 3.50
   5. 3.51 - 4.00

36. What grade do you expect to get in this course?
   1. A
   2. B (S)
   3. C
   4. D
   5. F (U)
   6. P
   7. N
   8. Audit
   9. Other (please specify)

37. Is this course within your major program?
   1. Yes
   2. No

38. Is this course required or optional?
   1. Required
   2. Optional
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Kansas State: Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses – Short Form
STUDENT REACTIONS TO INSTRUCTION AND COURSES -- SHORT FORM

By giving thoughtful and honest answers to these questions, you will help your instructor improve this course and his teaching procedures. Omit items which are not applicable to your instructor or this course.

PART I. Describe your instructor's teaching procedures by using the following code:
1 = Hardly Ever  2 = Occasionally  3 = Sometimes  4 = Frequently  5 = Almost Always

The Instructor:
1. Promoted teacher-student discussion (as opposed to mere responses to questions).
2. Found ways to help students answer their own questions.
3. Encouraged students to express themselves freely and openly.
4. Seemed enthusiastic about the subject matter.
5. Changed his approach to meet new situations.
6. Spoke with expressiveness and variety in tone of voice.
7. Demonstrated the importance and significance of his subject matter.
8. Made presentations which were dry and dull.
9. Made it clear how each topic fit into the course.
10. Explained the reasons for his criticisms of students' academic performance.
11. Encouraged student comments even when they turned out to be incorrect or irrelevant.
12. Summarized material in a manner which aided retention.
13. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.
14. Stated clearly the objectives of the course.
15. Explained course material clearly, and explanations were to the point.
16. Related course material to real life situations.
17. Gave examinations which stressed unnecessary memorization.
18. Gave examination questions which were unreasonably detailed (picky).

PART II. On the next four questions, compare this course with others you have taken at this institution, using the following code:
1 = Much Less Than Most Courses  2 = Less Than Most  3 = About Average  4 = More Than Most  5 = Much More Than Most

The Course:
19. Amount of reading.
20. Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments.
22. Degree to which the course hung together (various topics and class activities were related to each other).

PART III. Compare the progress you have made in this course with that made in other courses you have taken at this college or university, using the following code:
1 = Lowest 20% of Courses I have taken here  2 = Next 20%  3 = Middle 40%  4 = Next 20%  5 = Upper 10%

Your Progress:
23. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).
24. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories.
25. Learning to apply course material to improve rational thinking, problem-solving and decision making.
26. Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course.
27. Learning how professionals in this field go about the process of gaining new knowledge.
30. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual-cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.).
31. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing.
32. Discovering the implications of the course material for understanding myself (interests, talents, values, etc.).

PART IV. Describe your personal attitudes and behavior in this course, using the following code:
1 = Definitely False  2 = More False Than True  3 = About Even  4 = More True Than False  5 = Definitely True

Self-Rating:
33. I worked harder on this course than on most courses I have taken.
34. I had a strong desire to take this course.
35. I would like to take another class from this instructor.
36. As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study.

If your instructor has extra questions, answer them in the space designated on the Answer Form.

Your comments on how the instructor might improve this course or his teaching are invited; use the space provided.

©1973 Donald P. Hoyt and Richard E. Owens. Reprinted by permission. For further information contact Office of Educational Resources, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.
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Palomar College Course Rating Sheet
PALOMAR COLLEGE
COURSE RATING SHEET
Spring 1968

Course: ____________________________
e.g.: Engl. 1A, Art 2A.

Instructor: _________________________

Circle the appropriate number or letter preceding or following each statement. DO NOT GIVE YOUR NAME.

CONTENT:

**text** 1 2 3 4 5 A. The text is pertinent and useful in the course.

**obj** 1 2 3 4 5 B. Course objectives as defined by the Instructor have been satisfied.

**cur** 1 2 3 4 5 C. The subject matter is current.

PRESENTATION:

**clr** 1 2 3 4 5 A. The Instructor presents subject matter clearly.

**org** 1 2 3 4 5 B. Course presentation is well organized.

**mod**

- **a** At a Moderate pace
- **b** At a Rapid pace
- **c** At a Slow pace

**fst**

**slo**

D. The amount of material covered during lectures

- **a** Quite adequate
- **b** Quite extensive
- **c** Quite sparse

**adq**

**exc**

**spr**

**prp** 1 2 3 4 5 E. The Instructor's lectures are well prepared.

**log** 1 2 3 4 5 F. Lectures follow in a logical order.

**que** 1 2 3 4 5 G. There is adequate opportunity for questions.

**ans** 1 2 3 4 5 H. Questions are handled adequately.

**opn** 1 2 3 4 5 I. The Instructor is tolerant of student opinions.

**dis** 1 2 3 4 5 J. The Instructor stimulates class discussion.
### Course Rating Sheet (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor:</th>
<th>Course:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### THE SCALE:
1. Strongly Agree  
2. Agree  
3. No Opinion  
4. Disagree  
5. Strongly Disagree

#### ASSIGNMENTS:

| A. The work load is  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mod</td>
<td>hwy</td>
<td>esy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| b) Beyond student capabilities  
c) Below student capabilities  
|  
| B. The student knows what is expected.  
| expt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  
| C. Tests are related to the text or lecture material.  
| rel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  
| D. The number of tests is  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mny</td>
<td>few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a) Adequate  
b) Too many  
c) Not enough  
|  
| E. Test questions are clearly stated.  
| clr | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  
| F. The Instructor's grading of tests is fair.  
| fr | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  
| G. Time allowed for tests is adequate.  
| time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  
| H. The Instructor is actively interested in students and trying to help them learn.  
| help | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

#### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:  
(On separate page)
Appendix 9

Student Rating of Instructor
## STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course: __________  Instructor: __________

### POSITIVE PERSONAL TRAITS (1-5)
- (Appearance, Attitude, Judgement, etc.)

### KNOWLEDGE (1-5)
- (Command of Subject)

### CLASS PRESENTATION (1-5)
- (Planning, Organization, Skill)

### EVALUATION OF STUDENTS (1-5)
- (Understanding, Accurate, Fair)

Comments: (Use Reverse Side if Necessary)
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Eastern Michigan University: Instructor and Course Evaluation Form
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE EVALUATION FORM

This evaluation is one of many possible sources of data for use in:
1) student course selection,
2) faculty development in teaching, and
3) the evaluation of instructional effectiveness.

A summary of the responses to the CORE ITEMS will be published.

This evaluation is designed to be totally anonymous. Your instructor will not see nor handle these forms until semester grades have been submitted.

SENTENCE

CORE ITEMS

WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL RATING OF THE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS INSTRUCTOR?

WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL RATING OF THIS COURSE?

ITEMS ADDED BY INSTRUCTOR OR DEPARTMENT

MY INSTRUCTOR DISPLAYS A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF COURSE TOPICS.
MY INSTRUCTOR HAS AN EFFECTIVE STYLE OF PRESENTATION.
MY INSTRUCTOR SEEMS WELL-PREPARED FOR CLASS.
MY INSTRUCTOR STIMULATES INTEREST IN THE COURSE.
MY INSTRUCTOR MAKES GOOD USE OF EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.
MY INSTRUCTOR IS ACTIVELY HELPFUL WHEN STUDENTS HAVE PROBLEMS.
I UNDERSTAND WHAT IS EXPECTED OF ME IN THIS COURSE.
GRADES ARE ASSIGNED FAIRLY AND IMPARTIALLY.
MY INSTRUCTOR MOTIVATES ME TO DO MY BEST WORK.
I LEARNED A LOT IN THIS COURSE.

***************

USE PENCIL ONLY...DON'T SKIP THE CORE ITEMS.

1988-89 STUDENT RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE IN BOOKSTORE FOR $1.00

COMMENTS

WHAT DID YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THIS INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE?

WHAT DID YOU DISLIKE MOST ABOUT THIS INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE?

WHAT CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR THIS INSTRUCTOR OR COURSE?

Continue Comments on Back
## African-American Studies

### Instructor Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Dept CRS</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Res/Enr</th>
<th>Rating of Instructor</th>
<th>Rating of Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Lindsey</td>
<td>AAS 101</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>39/51</td>
<td>89% A 21% B 41% C 31% D 0% E</td>
<td>84% A 41% B 21% C 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Orisan</td>
<td>AAS 203</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>32/43</td>
<td>16% A 34% B 31% C 16% D 3% E</td>
<td>22% A 25% B 31% C 16% D 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Sanders</td>
<td>AAS 101</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>38/89</td>
<td>3% A 3% B 13% C 32% D 50% E</td>
<td>5% A 8% B 16% C 37% D 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Semmes</td>
<td>AAS 101</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>57/93</td>
<td>44% A 46% B 9% C 0% D 2% E</td>
<td>37% A 39% B 21% C 2% D 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### African-American Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Dept CRS</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Res/Enr</th>
<th>Rating of Instructor</th>
<th>Rating of Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Armstrong</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>17/28</td>
<td>53% A 35% B 12% C 0% D 0% E</td>
<td>35% A 47% B 18% C 0% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Avedon</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>Wi91</td>
<td>30/48</td>
<td>37% A 43% B 17% C 3% D 0% E</td>
<td>17% A 50% B 30% C 3% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Beginin</td>
<td>FA 314</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>12/11</td>
<td>53% A 42% B 17% C 0% D 8% E</td>
<td>50% A 25% B 25% C 0% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bocklage</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>37/49</td>
<td>14% A 46% B 22% C 11% D 8% E</td>
<td>5% A 30% B 41% C 19% D 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Bushey</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>21/52</td>
<td>29% A 37% B 26% C 9% D 0% E</td>
<td>23% A 34% B 31% C 11% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Chew</td>
<td>FA 123</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Wi91</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>36% A 36% B 27% C 0% D 0% E</td>
<td>27% A 55% B 18% C 0% D 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Dept CRS</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Res/Enr</th>
<th>Rating of Instructor</th>
<th>Rating of Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Armstrong</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>17/28</td>
<td>53% A 35% B 12% C 0% D 0% E</td>
<td>35% A 47% B 18% C 0% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Avedon</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>Wi91</td>
<td>30/48</td>
<td>37% A 43% B 17% C 3% D 0% E</td>
<td>17% A 50% B 30% C 3% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Beginin</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>12/11</td>
<td>53% A 42% B 17% C 0% D 8% E</td>
<td>50% A 25% B 25% C 0% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bocklage</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>37/49</td>
<td>14% A 46% B 22% C 11% D 8% E</td>
<td>5% A 30% B 41% C 19% D 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Bushey</td>
<td>FA 100</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fa90</td>
<td>21/52</td>
<td>29% A 37% B 26% C 9% D 0% E</td>
<td>23% A 34% B 31% C 11% D 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Chew</td>
<td>FA 123</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Wi91</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>36% A 36% B 27% C 0% D 0% E</td>
<td>27% A 55% B 18% C 0% D 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
History

For many years, the Wisconsin Student Association has worked to provide students with information to help in the difficult process of selecting professors. The central snag in this enterprise lies in the fact that students are not allowed to examine departmentally-administered evaluations. Therefore, our projects are necessarily limited; we simply cannot, with our budget, recreate university evaluations of professors. For this reason, we focus on the best. There is, I think, much merit in this approach, yet eventually students must be given access to information that will allow us to make informed choices as to which classes to take, and which to avoid. Until that day, we do our best with what we can gather.

With these limitations enumerated, it can be stressed that there is much that is unique in this project. First, this is the most comprehensive student-initiated evaluation of professors in the history of UW-Madison. We distributed questionnaires in all schools of the university, and in a majority of the 194 departments. Second, the range of information gathered is unprecedented—the teaching philosophies, the biographies, the interviews, the lists of past teaching awards. Never before has this information been collected into one place. Finally, this may be the last time this project is done on a limited scope. After years of work, full access to aggregate results of department evaluations of professors may be in our reach. Stop by our office to join us in this most important effort.

The Experiment

After consultation with teaching, evaluation, and statistics experts, our committee decided upon the following experiment. We drew up a form which asked each student to select the best professor they had had based on the following eight criteria:

1. This professor was knowledgeable and clearly conveyed this knowledge.
2. This professor made me re-think my opinions and beliefs.
3. This professor was open-minded, non-biased, and respected opposing ideas.
4. This professor included all relevant groups and ideas in the curriculum.
5. This professor was approachable outside of class.
6. This professor provided feedback on a continual basis, not just at the end of the semester.
7. This professor provided an opportunity for students to interact with and react to each other during the lecture.
8. This professor affected my life in a positive way.

We believe these qualities are essential in any great teacher. Many students, though, offered the following criticism: "Open-mindedness, including relevant groups and ideas, and affecting life in a positive way," so the argument went, "are all well and good in humanities classes, but they really don't apply to the sciences." This sentiment is understandable, yet I maintain that even the most rigorous, technical science benefits from a presentation informed with the above characteristics. Many seem to believe that it is only the humanities which have room for subjective interpretation and require professors with broad and flexible understandings. All subjects, if tapped for their inherent mystery and beauty, demand sensitive, thoughtful, and diverse interpretations. Mathematics is much more than equations, and engineering is an art as much as painting. The professors selected from the math department are an excellent example of these types of professors—students often commented on the fact that these men and women did much more than just convey statistics and equations; they added a touch of humanity, they highlighted the deeper meanings of mathematics, and in this they truly inspired their students to seek knowledge and...
Dunham, Randall
Business
Was knowledgeable and clearly conveyed this knowledge ...100%
Included all relevant groups of people and ideas in curriculum ...98.0%
Provided opportunity for student interaction during lecture ...96.0%

"Professor Dunham has a refreshing teaching style. I looked forward to
lecture every time. His enthusiasm is contagious, it seems as though
he's talking directly to you, though there are 40 other students in class."
"A great educator, plain and simple."

Formisano, Roger
Business
Was knowledgeable and clearly conveyed this knowledge ...95.6%
Included all relevant groups of people and ideas in curriculum ...92.5%
Was approachable outside of class ...92.5%

"One in a million. Made me really want to go to class. His deft mingling
of theory with real-life examples made the material interesting and
understandable. Great sense of humor." "Informative, entertaining,
friendly, and helpful. He made me realize the importance of insurance not
only as a business option, but also as a necessity in protecting your
assets."

"The value of a good education," says Professor Formisano, "is in the
formation of good people." He will be on leave next year, but anyone
around in the fall of 1993 won't want to miss his courses.

Hanson, Ernest
Business
Was knowledgeable and clearly conveyed this knowledge ...95.0%
Was approachable outside of class ...94.0%
Was open-minded and respected opposing ideas ...92.0%

"Very approachable, friendly and fair. His attitudes toward accounting really
sparked my interest in the subject. I owe it to him that it is now my major."

This fall, Professor Hanson will teach Business 700: Financial Accounting, which is
designed to help students to read, understand, and interpret a basic set of financial
statements.

"Let's turn North Vietnam into a parking lot."
-Ronald Reagan, 1968

"The value of a good education," says Professor Formisano, "is in the
formation of good people."

"We're all in the gutter, but some of us are looking up at
the stars."
-Oscar Wilde
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Undergraduate Course Guide 1995
DIRECTIONS FOR INTERPRETING THE STATISTICS

DEPARTMENT AND COURSE NUMBER:
Course Title (Crosslisting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETURN</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>DIFFICULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>XX/XX</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return: The number of usable forms returned out of the total number of students enrolled. An asterisk (*) denotes a student return of less than fifty percent.

Course: Overall rating of the course.

Instructor: Overall rating of the instructor(s).

Difficulty: Overall rating of the difficulty of the course.

Name: Instructor of given section.

Mean: Using a four point scale, where 4.00 is the highest and 0.00 is the lowest.

N/A: Not available. (Please note: language courses are not assigned a difficulty rating, as difficulty in these courses will vary with the aptitude of the individual).

Special Note: If you do not find a course in a department, please be sure to check the department in which the course is cross-listed. Each course is only written up once.

ACCOUNTING

ACCOUNTING 101: Principles of Accounting I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETURN</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>DIFFICULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Prophetis</td>
<td>86/14</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Prophetis</td>
<td>50/90</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Prophetis</td>
<td>78/136</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course is an introduction to the basic concepts and standards of accounting information systems. There is an emphasis on financial reporting with preparation of balance sheets, income statements, and statements of cash flow. There are no prerequisites for this course, and credit is given to Wharton students only upon completion of 101 and 102.

Students found that completion of problems and practice entries was very helpful in understanding the material. Students agreed that "lectures and recitations were both very helpful." However, there was a general feeling that the exams did not adequately reflect the material covered in lectures.

Students were pleased with the way Professor De Prophetis presented the material in the lectures, though a few students felt that she went through material too quickly. One enthusiastic student commented: "She communicates accounting like Cypress Hill communicates their love of ganja."

The students in this course were mainly Wharton sophomores fulfilling a general requirement. Most students expected to receive A's and B's. Students strongly recommended this course for majors, but they did not recommend it for non-majors.

ACCOUNTING 102: Principles of Accounting II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETURN</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>DIFFICULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aksu</td>
<td>91/141</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksu</td>
<td>85/135</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course concentrates on the internal use of accounting data for managerial planning operations, decision making, and controlling operations. All Wharton students must take this course before they can receive credit for Accounting 101.

Students were not extremely pleased with this course. They felt that the exams were more difficult than the example problems, though they found that...
Mostly sophomores and seniors took this course for their major or as an elective. Nearly every student expected an A in the course after spending between 2 and 3 hours each week preparing for the class.

WOMEN'S STUDIES 436: The Colonial Years to the 20th Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETURN COURSE INSTRUCTOR DIFFICULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/24 3.10 3.50 2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women's Studies 436 examines the plight of women throughout American history.

This course was described as wonderful and informative, and one student recommended that "everyone take this course."

Students also liked Professor Hot. They said she was accessible and interesting, although some commented that she was very conservative.

Juniors and seniors took this course either for their major or for the General Requirement. Every student expected an A after spending between 3 and 4 hours each week preparing for the class.

NOTEABLE COURSES AND PROFESSORS

Editor's Note: In order for a course or professor to be listed here, there must have been at least ten forms returned and the number that were returned must have been at least half of those enrolled. Each professor is only listed once; if a professor qualified more than once, we selected either the best or worst of the possible choices (depending on which category the professor was qualifying for).

PERFECT PROFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>PSYC 002</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camfield</td>
<td>ENGL 286</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunning</td>
<td>RELS 438</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>GREK 001</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filsres</td>
<td>ENGL 285</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frye</td>
<td>SPAN 121</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghandhi</td>
<td>FNCE 101</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>NURS 363</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>SYS 342</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteils</td>
<td>FREN 110</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omura</td>
<td>AMES 081</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrino</td>
<td>SPAN 120</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racevskis</td>
<td>FREN 121</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schatter</td>
<td>THAR 120</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidlauskas</td>
<td>ARTH 485</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>FREN 130</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>GRMN 002</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>PSYC 260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HALL OF FAME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
<td>SPAN 140</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>AMES 038</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>FREN 140</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascarelli</td>
<td>FREN 110</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>MGMT 231</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>RETURN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bau</td>
<td>MEAM 338</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td>LGST 101</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendix</td>
<td>FOLK 434</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein</td>
<td>MUSC 040</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>CHEM 462</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibbee</td>
<td>FREN 110</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bissinger</td>
<td>URBS 252</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourlatksyja</td>
<td>RUSS 004</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breuer</td>
<td>RELS 113</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownlee</td>
<td>ARTH 482</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancro</td>
<td>BIOL 404</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carley</td>
<td>ACCT 230</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroly-Alter</td>
<td>FREN 227</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartier-Chandler</td>
<td>FREN 140</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavallo</td>
<td>ENGL 115</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>BIOL 432</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constan</td>
<td>LGST 101</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daemmrich</td>
<td>GRMN 055</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>SPAN 110</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deudney</td>
<td>PSCI 154</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch</td>
<td>HIST 100</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deweer-D’Hooghe</td>
<td>FREN 212</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson-Evans</td>
<td>FREN 340</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>FREN 130</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebbs</td>
<td>PHIL 331</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td>MATH 140</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>ENGL 202</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espejo-Saavedra</td>
<td>SPAN 110</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esposito</td>
<td>SPAN 212</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezquerra</td>
<td>SPAN 140</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faust</td>
<td>HIST 200</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>PSCI 157</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foglia</td>
<td>LGST 233</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambhir</td>
<td>SARS 216</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaskins</td>
<td>ANTH 462</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glandt</td>
<td>CHE 351</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>SPAN 130</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales-Cameron</td>
<td>SPAN 140</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorton</td>
<td>FNCE 203</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>MGMT 237</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>BIBB 210</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>PSCI 187</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayashi</td>
<td>AMES 081</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heywood</td>
<td>FREN 110</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillman</td>
<td>HCMG 203</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofshi</td>
<td>AMES 053</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>MGMT 104</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inman</td>
<td>FNCE 230</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isser</td>
<td>THAR 120</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalbert</td>
<td>MUSC 025</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamieson</td>
<td>COMM 226</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez</td>
<td>SPAN 130</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>DENV 445</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns</td>
<td>ARTH 489</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>MGMT 238</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juddd</td>
<td>MUSC 070</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td>ENGL 202</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemerer</td>
<td>OPIM 210</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kors</td>
<td>HIST 201</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafleur</td>
<td>CLST 195</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapadula</td>
<td>ENGL 116</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees</td>
<td>ENGL 220</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>AMES 475</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>SPAN 317</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>MGMT 238</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>SPAN 380</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>FREN 110</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>SPAN 130</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>SPAN 140</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>RELS 434</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazer</td>
<td>ENGL 078</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>RSCI 215</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCord</td>
<td>PPM 023</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>GRMN 001</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McInerney</td>
<td>CLST 145</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messaris</td>
<td>COMM 462</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>AMES 486</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>LGST 101</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>SARS 061</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisset</td>
<td>FREN 140</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>SPAN 130</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>CHE 353</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTEABLE QUOTEABLES

SAID ABOUT PROFESSORS...

"Don't let the name fool you, Dr. Hammarberg is a stud."

"I tend to miss Schuyler's humor when I'm taking an unexpected nap," remarked one sleepy student.

Professor Spooner was described as "drier than a bowl of cereal without milk."

Professor Mann was described by his students as being "more animated than a Disney cartoon."

"Dr. Opendak's mad scientist/E.T. look along with a drug-induced behavior made this a most enjoyable class."

"Dr. Szyrmer ought to be indicted for crimes against the teaching profession!"

"Zeal is cool, insanely bright, brightly insane, kind, and a whole heap of weird fun in the midst of much ordinary garbage."

"Varma is as cool as the Sultan in Alladin, only he knows about finance."

Professor Lohse "has half the charisma of a decomposing corpse."

Professor Thayer was described as "a rugged individualist with an Einstein coiffure."

"It seems obvious which plants Professor Binns experimented with as an undergrad." All students were in agreement, "Binns kicked ass."

One student asked "Dr. Lo is really Yoko Ono, isn't she?"

Dr. Shultz was also hard to find; one student complained that "it was easier to see the President than Dr. Shultz."

Professor Wallace "should be the ruler of a mid-sized country and all should bow to him."

"I often got the impression that Dr. Nelson was like our coach, 'coaching' us for the big Organic game."

While one student praised him for "making even the driest material wetter than water." Another student stated that "Dr. Evens makes me feel retarded because he thinks statistics is so easy even a monkey can do it."

"I am impressed with Dr. Voet's knowledge. I just wish he could share it with the rest of us."

"You can find Professor O'Donnell on-line after midnight on many occasions, writing to students. He e-mails me more often than my friends do."

SAID ABOUT LECTURES...

Dr. Wildenhain "could not explain his way out of a paper bag," laments one student.

"In terms of Professor Holod's lecturing I would just like to ask her to tell me when she could give a lecture to my brother who is suffering from insomnia - so he can finally fall asleep!"

"Clocked at 1000 'um's' an hour," laments one student. Simply put, "Dr. Rees made me see stars."

Perhaps students enjoyed attending class because Dr. Janzen "scratched [his] butt while lecturing."

"A bomb could blow up Chemistry 102 and Professor Waltz would keep on talking to the board, without changing his boring, expressionless voice."

Professor De Prophetis communicates accounting like "Cypress Hill communicates their love of ganga."

"If you were to bet me $1000 that I could pay attention for just one lecture, I wouldn't take that bet."

"Murnaghan is so boring that if I was on speed I could still fall asleep!"

"Even Dr. Smith has been caught catching a few Z's for himself."

616
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The Source Guide: Boston University
claims that professor Haeri "relied on students' presumed ignorance of the subject in order for the class to go smoothly."

AN 285
Coping With Crisis in Contemporary Africa
Allan Hoben

Course Description: Anthropology 285 primarily explores the food and environmental crises in sub-Saharan Africa. The exploration juxtaposes outsiders' perspectives, exemplified by the press and in statements by development agencies, and local people's perspectives revealed through anthropological and other materials. Other crises are explored through discussion of contemporary events.


Grade Composition: Participation (33%), Quizzes and midterm (33%), Final (33%).

Course Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Response Rate: 53.3%</th>
<th>Enrollment: 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload Overall</td>
<td>![ ] (1)</td>
<td>![ ] (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty Overall</td>
<td>![ ] (1)</td>
<td>![ ] (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>![ ] (1)</td>
<td>![ ] (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor

| Enthusiasm Rating | ![ ] (1) | ![ ] (2) | ![ ] (3) | ![ ] (4) | ![ ] (5) |
| Effectiveness Rating | ![ ] (1) | ![ ] (2) | ![ ] (3) | ![ ] (4) | ![ ] (5) |
| Stimulates Interest | ![ ] (1) | ![ ] (2) | ![ ] (3) | ![ ] (4) | ![ ] (5) |
| Available to Students | ![ ] (1) | ![ ] (2) | ![ ] (3) | ![ ] (4) | ![ ] (5) |
| Overall Rating | ![ ] (1) | ![ ] (2) | ![ ] (3) | ![ ] (4) | ![ ] (5) |

Student Comments:

Instructor: One half of respondents rave about Professor Allan Hoben's enthusiasm for, and knowledge of, the subject matter. "Professor Hoben is an effective teacher full of good stories and first hand accounts of his experiences," claims one student. Another writes, "He is obviously well informed and interested in the subject matter." However, one half of respondents claim that the professor is not interested in the subject. One writes, "Professor Hoben is very interesting and this course had a lot of potential. Too bad he didn't seem too interested in the class." Nearly all respondents praise his organization and teaching style. "He is open-minded, encouraged us to think for ourselves, and helped raise questions that stimulated my interest in the course," applauds one student.

AN 290
Children and Culture
Robert W. Hefner

Course Description: Anthropology 290 explores infant and child development with respect to cultural influences and variations from society to society. The course investigates the different concepts people have of childhood and the broader changes that have reshaped family, society, and individuals' identities.


Grade Composition: Participation (10%), Paper (20%), Midterm (35%), Final (35%).
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Teacher - Course Evaluation: Duke University
TEACHER-COURSE EVALUATION

Course #:_____  Section:___  Course Name:_______________  Instructor:_____________

Please enter a number from 1-5 in the box next to each item on this page, using this scale:

5 = excellent / 4 = good / 3 = adequate / 2 = fair / 1 = poor

Also, write comments for items on both the front and back side of the sheet. Examples of possible topics are
given for each item; use them or any others that are relevant. Include strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate.

1) COURSE
   Comments (e.g., content, structure, approach, educational value)

2) INSTRUCTOR
   Comments (e.g., presentation, organization, knowledge, accessibility, responsiveness, enthusiasm)

3) INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION
   Comments (e.g., amount and type of thinking you did)

4) DEMAND LEVEL  Overall, how demanding was this course? Please use this scale:
   5 = very high / 4 = high / 3 = moderate / 2 = low / 1 = very low

Please continue on back
5) MATERIALS (e.g., if relevant: value of readings, films, demonstrations, projects, labs, computer programs)

i) EVALUATION METHODS (e.g., the educational value of tests, papers, homework)

) CLASSROOM DYNAMICS Circle term for type of course: lecture / seminar / lab / other = ____
(e.g., given this type of course, assess student participation, interest level, discussions, peer review)

) ADJECTIVE What adjective best describes this course?

) ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
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WMU Letter to Professors
Professor,

For the past five years the Western Student Association (WSA) has attempted to produce a workable and accurate faculty evaluation from the point of view of the students because the current evaluation system didn't meet their needs. Initial attempts to create such an instrument produced many negative comments from faculty members who felt that students were not qualified to evaluate professors, and the results would create a popularity contest. Students felt that the instrument did not give the information they wanted, which would be to help them decide which classes to take.

Accepting these criticisms as valid I decided to work on an evaluation instrument that would be both fair to faculty and useful to students.

Therefore, the new instrument is changed from evaluation of competence to a description of teaching style. Students could match their learning style with a professor's teaching style so that the student could get the most from their classes. The benefit for the student will be a more compatible learning environment. Whereas the benefit for the university would be that the student would not drop a course after one or two class periods.

On the following page is the instrument as it now stands. This could be distributed to the students with the regular departmental evaluations. The results would be published and placed in the campus bookstore. As stated earlier, this descriptive instrument is meant to be as non-threatening as possible.

In order to create an instrument that is useful, appropriate, and accurate, please take a moment to look at this and make any comments that you feel would make it even better. This instrument, and the related research will result in a final paper for my honors thesis. I greatly appreciate any feedback you could give me. I thank you for your time.

Christopher A. Lewis

Note: Please send all responses in campus mail in care of:

Dr. Loren Crane
Department of Communications
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Brain Research: Left / Right Brain
High level thinking involves:
1. enduring frustration
2. breaking mind sets
3. listening and following directions

Usually one side of the brain is leading—influences action.

Need to stimulate both sides—that's higher thinking. Balance more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left Brain</th>
<th>Right Brain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>Images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right or wrong answers</td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Risk-takers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Need neat environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never assumes</td>
<td>Long-term memory good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need constant reinforcement</td>
<td>Short-term memory bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract-liking people</td>
<td>Space Cadets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Random learning and thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listers</td>
<td>Short attention spans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-conscious</td>
<td>Put these close to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows directions closely</td>
<td>Need eye contact to comprehend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filers</td>
<td>Need touching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good planners</td>
<td>Takes them longer to get ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishes things quicker</td>
<td>Don't read directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prone to stress-related diseases</td>
<td>Don't pay attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionists</td>
<td>Filers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One task at a time</td>
<td>More flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be put in gentle risking situations</td>
<td>More fun-loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysists</td>
<td>Accident prone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts</td>
<td>Need to have goals set for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Multi-tasks needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes names</td>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More serious</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes improvising</td>
<td>Holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract thinking</td>
<td>Visual learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonics</td>
<td>Recognizes faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving known</td>
<td>Likes improvising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fiction</td>
<td>Geometric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teach to the weak side, but accept preferences.

By the way, there are physical differences in male and female brains.
The right side of a female's brain is more developed than a male's right side, and the left side of the male's brain is more developed than the left side of a female. But a female seems to be able to use both sides a little more easily.
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Suggestions for Learning Strengths
Suggestions for Auditory Strengths

General Hints
You will benefit from hearing information—audio tapes, your own voice, or lectures.
You may want to make tapes of reading assignments or class notes.
Pretend that you are teaching someone else the information and explain it out loud.
Reading aloud notes or text material will help you.

Lecture Hints
Use a cassette tape player as pre-testing by asking yourself questions, leaving a 2-3 second blank space, and then give the answer.
Use a cassette player to record difficult material from your notes.
Orally test yourself by asking questions from your notes.
Read aloud any difficult material in your notes.
If you can't read aloud, try vocalizing the words quietly.

Textbook Hints
Read aloud summary statements, headings, and subheadings before you begin reading a chapter.
Restate key ideas to yourself as you read material. Keep a “conversation” going with your text as you read (agree or disagree with the author, or question key ideas).
For difficult material, restate in your own words, what you have just read.
Read aloud, vocalize, or whisper passages that are difficult.
Read vocabulary words and their definitions before you begin reading.
After reading, quiz yourself (aloud) over the vocabulary.
Orally quiz yourself over selected main ideas.
Tape yourself reading difficult text sections, and then go back and listen to them.

Suggestions for Visual Strengths

General Hints
You will benefit from seeing information—either in print or from videos, charts, or overheads.
It will be easier for you to remember what you read than what you hear.
When given information orally, you should write it down or take some notes.

Lectures Hints
Read the text before attending lectures.
Take notes, over lecture material.
For difficult or confusing material, use a mapping technique along with notes. (Mapping is drawing a diagram of the material read, using only the main ideas. You show the relationship among the ideas with lines connecting the ideas)
Use white space on your page as a guide when taking notes.
To learn material, stare off into space and remember what the written information looked like on your page.

Textbook Hints
Preview chapters by reading the headings, subheadings, and outlines before reading the chapter.
Watch for topic sentences. Reread them to help you stay with the material being read. Underline topic sentences.
Draw a diagram, jot down a list, use mapping, or make a chart to help you retain difficult material.
Underline key words and concepts as you read. Marking your text will be very helpful.
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Learning Modality
### Learning Modality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>In Class</strong></th>
<th><strong>When Studying</strong></th>
<th><strong>During Exams</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading / Writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kinesthetic</strong></td>
<td><strong>During Exams</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In Class
- underline
- use different colors
- use symbols, charts, arrangements on a page
- attend lectures and tutorials
- discuss topics with students
- explain new ideas to other people
- use a tape recorder
- describe overheads, pictures, and visuals to somebody not there
- leave space in notes for later recall

#### When Studying
- use the "In Class"
- reconstruct images in different ways
- redraw pages from memory
- replace words with symbols and initials
- may take poor notes because you prefer to listen
- expand your notes
- put summarized notes on tape and listen
- read summarized notes out loud
- explain notes to another A person
- write out the words again and again
- reread notes silently
- rewrite ideas into other words
- organize diagrams into statements
- may take notes poorly because topics do not seem relevant
- put examples in note summaries
- use pictures and photos to illustrate
- talk about notes with another K person

#### During Exams
- recall the 'pictures of the pages'
- draw, use diagrams where appropriate
- practice turning visuals back into words
- listen to your voices and write them down
- speak your answers
- practice writing answers to old exam questions
- practice with multiple-choice questions
- write out lists
- write paragraphs, beginnings, endings
- write practice answers
- role-play the exam situation in your room

---

*The Teaching Professor April 1993*
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American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Letter
AAUP and the administration is currently "in the works." Plans are afoot to beautify the grounds around Montague House, home of the AAUP on campus. A landscaper has volunteered his time for planning and implementing the beautification project. I have communicated with Vice President Bob Beam, who has agreed to have Western fund the project in terms of providing the necessary plantings and planting materials. A small planning committee is in the midst of developing plans for the planting project. All we need now are a "few good women and men" to volunteer their time and effort to do the planting! We are looking for faculty members who would like to get down and dirty in an effort to carry this off! The planting date is set for Saturday, May 31st, with a rain date of June 7th. Refreshments will be provided by the AAUP. This should be a fun project, with a lasting return for our efforts. If you would like to participate in the planting project, please call the AAUP to sign up.

While cooperative efforts are often advantageous, there are times when it is simply not in the best interest of the faculty to participate. The AAUP is deeply concerned about a recent mailing received by some faculty inviting them to participate in an honors thesis project which involves student ratings of faculty teaching. The AAUP is not opposed to student evaluations of faculty, particularly when the results of such evaluations are used to inform the faculty member about his/her teaching, thereby enabling the faculty member to make informed decisions about ways in which to enhance his/her teaching performance. However, the proposed student evaluation project raises some serious concerns about the use of data which are anonymous and unsubstantiated, particularly these data are slated for public distribution. There is no guarantee that such data, once published and made available through the university bookstore (as is promised in the mailing received by faculty), will not influence performance evaluations of faculty in matters such as tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions. The AAUP is in the process of investigating the appropriateness of the project, which appears to be in violation of certain HSIRB guidelines and restrictions (e.g., protecting the identity of faculty subjects; inclusion of full informed consent forms for participation). As Chapter President, I am heartened with each instance of cooperation that serves to build bridges between various members of the university community.

The project was originally given expedited status by Western's HSIRB, and therefore did not undergo a full board review prior to approval. At this point in time, the AAUP advises faculty to exercise extreme caution in deciding whether or not to participate in the project. If you do decide to participate in the project, and the results of the data publicized as proposed, there will be little, if anything, the AAUP can do to protect you against misuse or abuse of information garnered from student responses. If you have further questions about this project, please contact Cor Administrator Galen Alessi at the AA
Appendix 20

Scantron Form Used for Research
Appendix 21

Updated Letter to WMU Professors
Dear professor,

My name is Christopher Lewis, I am an undergraduate student studying Organizational Communication. I am contacting you in regards to the honors thesis that I am working on. It deals with student self-management of their education and in particular helps them in selecting courses that are either multi-sectioned or elective in nature. In general, my study looks at the match between student learning style and the teaching style of a professor which allows students to select courses for optimal learning. I have worked to create a form that was acceptable to professors, and at the same time was helpful to students.

To test faculty approval, a rough draft of the form was sent out to selected professors. To test student approval, the form was used in two classes during summer session.

I am asking professors to administer this survey during the winter semester. The final product of these collected evaluations will be printed and placed inside the WMU bookstore.

If you would be willing to administer the attached form to a class(s) of your choosing, please send the bottom of this letter in campus mail to:

Dr. Loren Crane, Dept. of Communication

You may call me at 7-1694, I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Christopher A. Lewis

Name:__________________________________________
Class(s):________________________________________
# of students:____________________________________
Comments:______________________________________
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The Teaching Style Survey

The Teaching Style Survey is not an evaluation instrument, either of the competence or the popularity of an instructor.

It is intended to be a description of class management, information management, and evaluation procedures from the student’s point of view.

The purpose is to help student decision making for:
1) multiple section courses
2) elective courses

The survey provides students with information:
1) that is on an instructor’s syllabus, but not available before the first class meeting.
2) about particular skill requirements. (writing, computer, etc.)
3) about instructor expectations.

The motivation for this project is the belief that when a student, with particular learning strengths, is matched with an instructor with a compatible teaching style, the quality of the educational experience is increased for both.

To make the results more readable, the 1 through 4 categories (percent of, degree of, agreement with) are expressed as 1 = very low, 2 = low, 3 = high, 4 = very high.
Your participation in filling out this survey is completely voluntary. You may discontinue filling it out at any time without penalty. This survey is also completely anonymous.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
TEACHING STYLE SURVEY

Course ________________________ Instructor ________________________

Choose approximate percentage for each category. If a category does not apply mark NA. Mark each question on the answer form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR USE OF CLASS TIME</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT USE OF CLASS TIME</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Long paper(s) (5+pages)</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be able to memorize principles/facts,etc.</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF GRADE DETERMINED BY:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Attendance/participation</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Objective test(s) (T/F,MC,Fill in)</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assignments/projects</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATE AGREEMENT / DISAGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>Strong Dis.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BAS 200, Black Presence, Jones, L.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s) (T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear  

N = 34

BIOS 497, Senior Seminar, Fiscor, G.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  

N = 10
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

V. High
High
V. High
V. Low
NA
Low
V. Low
V. Low
Agree
Agree
Agree
Agree

CHEM 430, Physical Chemistry I, Miller, J. N = 43

1. Instructor uses lecture
2. Instructor interacts with students
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment
4. Time listening to lectures
5. Time in student group discussion
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use
7. Time for other in-class assignments
8. Reading (text, and/or other)
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)
12. Group project (lab, presentation)
13. Demonstrate originality
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

V. High
High
V. Low
V. High
V. Low
NA
V. Low
V. High
High
NA
NA
NA
V. Low
V. High
V. High
V. High
NA
V. Low
V. High
NA
V. Low
V. High
Agree
Agree
Agree
Agree
COM 104, Public Speaking, Crane, L.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

COM 170, Interpersonal Com. VanHoeven, S.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level  V. High
17. Demonstrate college writing level  V. High
18. Attendance/participation  V. Low
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)  Low
20. Essay exam(s)  V. Low
21. Assignments/projects  V. Low
22. Demonstrate skills  V. Low
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  St. Agree
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  St. Agree
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  St. Agree
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  St. Agree
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear  St. Agree

**COM 204, Advanced Speech, Crane, L.**  
N = 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Attendance/participation</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assignments/projects</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COM 335 Leadership, Dieker, R.  
**N = 23**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Instructor uses lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Instructor interacts with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Time listening to lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Time in student group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Time for other in-class assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Demonstrate originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Be able to apply principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Demonstrate college reading level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Demonstrate college writing level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Attendance/participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Objective test(s) (T/F, MC, Fill-in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Essay exam(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Assignments/projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Demonstrate skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COM 430, Theories of Persuasion, Crane, L.  
**N = 34**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Instructor uses lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Instructor interacts with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Time listening to lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Time in student group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Time for other in-class assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Demonstrate originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

Low
High
V. High
V. Low
V. Low
Low
High
High
Agree
Agree
St. Agree
Agree
Agree

COM 482, Communication Process in Orgs., Ford, W.  N = 23

1. Instructor uses lecture
2. Instructor interacts with students
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment
4. Time listening to lectures
5. Time in student group discussion
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use
7. Time for other in-class assignments
8. Reading (text, and/or other)
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)
12. Group project (lab, presentation)
13. Demonstrate originality
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

V. High
V. High
V. Low
High
Low
NA
V. High
NA
V. High
High
NA
V. High
High
V. High
V. High
NA
High
Low
Low
Low
Agree
St. Agree
Agree
St. Agree
Agree
**ECON 109  History of Modern Econ. Soc.,  Caruso, P.  N = 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Attendance/participation</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Assignments/projects</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECON 304, The Org. of Industry,  Alexander, D.  N = 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Attendance/participation</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Assignments/projects</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECON 320  Money and Banking, Caruso, P.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Attendance/participation</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Assignments/projects</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECON 345, Business, Govnmt. and Soc., Caruso, P.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear  

ECON 403, Intermediate Microecon., Alexander, D.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  

N = 23  
N = 21
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s(T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

ENGL 321 American Literature II, Kearcher, K.

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s(T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

V. High  
V. High  
V. High  
NA  
NA  
NA  
NA  
V. High  
NA  
Agree  
Agree  
Neutral  
Agree  
Disagree

N = 28

V. High  
V. High  
V. Low  
V. Low  
V. High  
NA  
V. Low  
V. High  
High  
V. Low  
NA  
NA  
V. High  
NA  
Agree  
Neutral  
St. Agree  
St. Agree  
Agree
### ENGL 364 Feature / Article Writing, Kearcher, K.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Attendance/participation</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assignments/projects</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENGL 566, Creative Writing Workshop, Johnston, A.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

HIST 326, Amer. Indian Cultural Hist., Galler, R.  N = 43

1. Instructor uses lecture
2. Instructor interacts with students
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment
4. Time listening to lectures
5. Time in student group discussion
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use
7. Time for other in-class assignments
8. Reading (text, and/or other)
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)
12. Group project (lab, presentation)
13. Demonstrate originality
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear
### Math

**MATH 114, Excursions in Math., Pence, D.**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>V. High</strong></td>
<td><strong>V. Low</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Instructor uses lecture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Instructor interacts with students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Time listening to lectures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Time in student group discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Time for in-class computer/equipment use</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Time for other in-class assignments</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Reading (text, and/or other)</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Short paper(s)/problem solving</strong></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Individual project (lab, presentation)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>Group project (lab, presentation)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>Demonstrate originality</strong></td>
<td>V. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</strong></td>
<td>V. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <strong>Be able to apply principles</strong></td>
<td>V. High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. <strong>Demonstrate college reading level</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. <strong>Demonstrate college writing level</strong></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. <strong>Attendance/participation</strong></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. <strong>Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. <strong>Essay exam(s)</strong></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. <strong>Assignments/projects</strong></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. <strong>Demonstrate skills</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. <strong>Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</strong></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>St. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. <strong>Tests are consistent with objectives</strong></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. <strong>Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</strong></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. <strong>Instructor receptive to questions in class</strong></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. <strong>Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</strong></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health and Human Services

**SPPA 203, Norm. Lang. Acquisition, Nelson, N.**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>V. High</strong></td>
<td><strong>V. Low</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Instructor uses lecture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Instructor interacts with students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Time listening to lectures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Time in student group discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Time for in-class computer/equipment use</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Time for other in-class assignments</strong></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Reading (text, and/or other)</strong></td>
<td>V. High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Short paper(s)/problem solving</strong></td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Individual project (lab, presentation)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>Group project (lab, presentation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speech Pathology

**Speech Pathology**

*No relevant data provided.*
13. Demonstrate originality
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

College of Education

ED 302, Teach. & Learn. in Second. Sch, Smith, C.P.  N = 27

1. Instructor uses lecture
2. Instructor interacts with students
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment
4. Time listening to lectures
5. Time in student group discussion
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use
7. Time for other in-class assignments
8. Reading (text, and/or other)
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)
12. Group project (lab, presentation)
13. Demonstrate originality
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

NA
V. High
V. High
V. High
V. High
V. Low
High
V. Low
High
V. Low
Agree
St. Agree
St. Agree
St. Agree

V. High
High
V. Low
Low
Low
V. Low
V. Low
Low
V. Low
High
V. Low
High
High
High
V. High
High
V. Low
V. High
High
High
Agree
Agree
St. Disagree
St. Disagree
St. Disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CECP 603 Tests and Measurements, Anderson, M.</th>
<th>N = 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demonstrate college writing level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Attendance/participation</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Essay exam(s)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assignments/projects</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Demonstrate skills</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tests are consistent with objectives</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Instructor receptive to questions in class</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CECP 650, Intellectual Assess., Anderson, M.</th>
<th>N = 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor uses lecture</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor interacts with students</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time listening to lectures</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in student group discussion</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time for other in-class assignments</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading (text, and/or other)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Short paper(s)/problem solving</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group project (lab, presentation)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrate originality</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be able to apply principles</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrate college reading level</td>
<td>V. High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s) T/F, MC, Fill-in
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

College of Business

BIS 142, Informational Writing, Beam, J.

V. High
V. Low
NA
NA
V. High
V. High
St. Agree
Neutral
St. Agree
St. Agree
St. Agree

V. High
V. High
V. Low
V. Low
Low
V. Low
V. Low
V. Low
V. High
NA
NA
NA
V. High
High
V. High
V. High
V. Low
High
High
NA
Agree
Agree
St. Agree
St. Agree
St. Agree

N = 32
BIS 350, Management Info. System., Halvas, E.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s)(T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear  

BIS 388, Records Management, Halvas, E.  

N = 49

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  

N = 15

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  

21
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s) (T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear  

**Engineering and Applied Sciences**

ECE 361, Electromagnet Fields,  Mason, J.  

1. Instructor uses lecture  
2. Instructor interacts with students  
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment  
4. Time listening to lectures  
5. Time in student group discussion  
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use  
7. Time for other in-class assignments  
8. Reading (text, and/or other)  
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving  
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)  
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)  
12. Group project (lab, presentation)  
13. Demonstrate originality  
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.  
15. Be able to apply principles  
16. Demonstrate college reading level  
17. Demonstrate college writing level  
18. Attendance/participation  
19. Objective test(s) (T/F, MC, Fill-in)  
20. Essay exam(s)  
21. Assignments/projects  
22. Demonstrate skills  
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives  
24. Tests are consistent with objectives  
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail  
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class  
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear  

N = 53  

V. High  
V. Low  
High  
NA  
High  
Low  
St. Agree  
St. Agree  
Agree  
St. Agree  
St. Agree  
V. High  
V. High  
NA  
V. High  
V. Low  
V. Low  
V. Low  
V. Low  
V. High  
NA  
NA  
NA  
NA  
High  
V. High  
V. High  
NA  
V. Low  
NA  
NA  
V. Low  
NA  
Agree  
Agree  
Agree  
St. Agree  
Agree
ME 256, Statics, Valasek, J.

1. Instructor uses lecture
2. Instructor interacts with students
3. Instructor uses audio-visual equipment
4. Time listening to lectures
5. Time in student group discussion
6. Time for in-class computer/equipment use
7. Time for other in-class assignments
8. Reading (text, and/or other)
9. Short paper(s)/problem solving
10. Long paper(s) (5+ pages)
11. Individual project (lab, presentation)
12. Group project (lab, presentation)
13. Demonstrate originality
14. Be able to memorize principles/facts, etc.
15. Be able to apply principles
16. Demonstrate college reading level
17. Demonstrate college writing level
18. Attendance/participation
19. Objective test(s) (T/F, MC, Fill-in)
20. Essay exam(s)
21. Assignments/projects
22. Demonstrate skills
23. Lectures/assign. are consistent with objectives
24. Tests are consistent with objectives
25. Instructor accessible outside of class or E/mail
26. Instructor receptive to questions in class
27. Feedback on tests/assignments is clear

N = 21

High
V. High
V. Low
V. Low
NA
V. Low
V. Low
V. High
NA
NA
NA
NA
V. High
V. High
NA
NA
V. Low
V. High
NA
V. Low
V. High
St. Agree
Agree
Agree
St. Agree
Agree